



# Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II A: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10128

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II A: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

**Agencies**

UNDP, UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/17/2019

**Review completed by PM**

4/20/2021

**Program Manager**

Milena Vasquez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **PIF** **CEO Endorsement**

### **Part I ? Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

#### **1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

12/23/2019: Overall yes, the project remains aligned with GEF climate change objective on the CBIT.

- Please check if the CBIT check mark can be clicked in Part I: Project Information.

(We note that this project was supported by the CBIT TF but the Portal does not allow this in a GEF-7 template.)

- Please clarify what is meant by the "pilot regional coordination initiative under Output 2.2" mentioned in the table showing changes from PIF. This is not something that was approved at the PIF and we believe may fit better under the Phase II project. It currently presents an overlap with other support. It also does not really fit the rest of the outputs in this component. Overall, Output 2.2. should be quite lean, considering that events organized at COPs and SBs are usually facilitated with the support of partner

organizations and do not cost a lot. The budget has a lump sum for this activity which is not clear and unacceptable.

- Please clarify if Output 2.4 overlaps with the support still provided under the GSP. Please comment on the need to carry out four regional workshops on this topic. Would this be as part of other workshops? Does this mean 1 in four regions or four in each (how many?) regions? While we believe this topic is important, it is strange for it to be highlighted in its own output instead of mainstreamed with the rest of the support. Further, there is support outside of the CBIT for this topic.

- Overall, the budget for Component 2 seems high compared to the activities listed for a two year duration. Please clarify.

- Please comment on how this project will ensure good coordination on the part of UNDP and UNEP so that it is truly implemented jointly as one program as opposed to one program implemented by two agencies, which has been the case of the GSP.

6/30/2020:

- CBIT check mark has been checked. Comment cleared.

- Thank you for this additional explanation. We note that there were no additional details added to the output in the portal entry. We support the piloting of regional-level work in this IIA project so that the IIB project can be better informed; nevertheless, we find the definition of this activity within Output 2.2 to be unclear. It may be better to turn this activity into its own output, as it exists in the Phase IIB project. Thus, additional details could be provided at the level of activities, which would provide additional information to the expected breakdown of the \$100,000 budget allocated.

- Thank you for this additional explanation. We believe it would make more sense for this topic to be integrated across the different activities (online knowledge products under Component 1, global meetings, side events, regional south-south networks). Nevertheless, we understand that having a separate output for it makes the contracting of a gender expert. Is the expectation that in Phase IIB it would be mainstreamed as the "heavy lifting" would mostly be carried out in Phase IIA? How will the regional work be integrated with the proposed support for the south-south MRV networks, including the LAC pilot in Component 2?

- Overall, we find that there is a mismatch in terms of scope among the different outputs and the level of detail in the activities described, which has not been addressed in this resubmission. We urge the agencies to go through the outputs and activities to ensure a comparable level of detail and scope and to present how this project and the IIB project will fit together. We also urge the agencies to also incorporate how the ongoing

pandemic might impact the planned activities. For example, it may necessitate a stronger focus on the online parts of the project and outreach. Already the meeting expected for this year has been postponed and the COP and SB meetings have also been postponed. How might this change the budget for these activities and how might the project adjust to this new reality? Please note that currently the project is expected to end in June 2023, which actually limits in person activities to two years.

- Comment not cleared. While the existing arrangements were successful for the initial set up of the platform, it was also chosen considering the ongoing GSP implementation. Now that we are entering a new phase with the closure/integration of the GSP, we urge the agencies to think about implementing different institutional arrangements that ensure a more coordinated approach and further avoid direct execution if possible. We believe it may be necessary to have an overall project manager,/coordinator which would be the key representative for the program. If necessary, the GEF would be happy to discuss this matter further with the agencies.

4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: Responses follow the comments in red text.

- Please clarify what is meant by the "pilot regional coordination initiative under Output 2.2" mentioned in the table showing changes from PIF. This is not something that was approved at the PIF and we believe may fit better under the Phase II project. It currently presents an overlap with other support. It also does not really fit the rest of the outputs in this component.

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The pilot regional coordination initiative referred to on page 6 is activity 2.2.4: Pilot the fostering of south-south peer exchange in climate transparency actions in the LAC region. We have now made this text clearer on that page. Our proposal is to phase out south-south support from country-project budgets and to support these activities instead through the Global Platform. This coordination at the regional level would (1) facilitate the effective translation of global platform support efforts in a way which is context and culturally specific and is also communicated in local languages (Spanish and English); (2) facilitate south-south exchanges between participating countries in the region, supporting the development of local capacity based on the sharing of locally applicable good practices, experiences and lessons learned on strengthening transparency frameworks. This activity will build upon the experiences of facilitating south-south exchanges through national projects, and, as mentioned previously, will lead to the phasing out of such support in country-project budgets. The person in charge of activity 2.2.4 will carry out measures (e.g. surveys, questionnaires, etc.) with LAC countries to determine the value of and demand for south-south support, to ensure an ongoing assessment of the value of such an activity. The related Terms of Reference have been revised to reflect this (see Annex G, page 62).

On overlap, we believe that this activity will be complementary to and build synergies with existing initiatives, rather than lead to duplicative efforts. The REDINGEI network financed by the GSP supports LAC countries with exchanges on GHG inventories. The recently established Caribbean Cooperative MRV Hub (CCMRVH) aims to play a similar role in the Caribbean. It will be ensured that activity 2.2.4 is complementary to such initiatives. In addition, activity 2.2.4 will go beyond such support to also support

the region's countries in building capacities on adaptation monitoring and evaluation, NDC tracking, tracking of financial, technology and capacity building support received, the development of Long Term Strategies and modelling tools, and the development of policy frameworks as outcomes of the national transparency framework. Therefore, while the GSP in LAC is focused on GHG Inventories and recently NDC tracking from the mitigation point of view, this CBIT regional support will be focused on additional areas of the Enhanced Transparency Framework particularly relevant to CBIT beneficiary countries. A strong communication between both networks will be ensured with the aim of building synergies, increasing the understanding of countries' needs and contexts and avoiding potential overlaps. Therefore, we do not believe there will be temporal or substantive overlap between the different initiatives, beyond that mentioned above. Furthermore, this activity is important during 2020-2022, as this is when most of the CBIT projects in the LAC region will be under implementation.

The creation of this regional network is aligned with the planning for the networks under the combined GSP/CBIT Full Size Project, Phase II-B. Activity 2.2.4 is meant to serve as a pilot for regional networks that could be replicated to other regions or adapted during Phase II-B. As noted above, and below, key to assessing the value of the pilot will be the tracking of country demand for south-south support.

While Component 1 is focused on the website platform and knowledge products, Activity 2.2.4 will focus on fostering peer exchange of lessons learnt and best practice, so we consider it fits better in Component 2, as one way of outreaching efforts to disseminate results.

Overall, Output 2.2. should be quite lean, considering that events organized at COPs and SBs are usually facilitated with the support of partner organizations and do not cost a lot. The budget has a lump sum for this activity which is not clear and unacceptable.

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The budget for Output 2.2 includes the cost of the annual stocktaking workshops and gender workshops. The budget notes in Annex H-1 provide a breakdown of the associated costs.

- Please clarify if Output 2.4 overlaps with the support still provided under the GSP. Please comment on the need to carry out four regional workshops on this topic. Would this be as part of other workshops? Does this mean 1 in four regions or four in each (how many?) regions? While we believe this topic is important, it is strange for it to be highlighted in its own output instead of mainstreamed with the rest of the support. Further, there is support outside of the CBIT for this topic.

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: Output 2.4 will not overlap with the support that is provided under the GSP; that support ends in February 2020.

The project will support one workshop in each of four regions, and the project will attempt to schedule workshops in tandem with other CBIT and regional events when possible. The description of project activities under output 2.4 has been updated to reflect both of these points.

While support for gender equality and women's participation are mainstreamed throughout the project and the number of beneficiaries who are women will be monitored in the project results framework, it will be easier to manage the work of a gender expert and to monitor women's participation from a single output that includes the updated guidance on gender in transparency and the communication of that guidance to countries through the regional workshops.

No support outside of the CBIT for mainstreaming gender into MRV and transparency activities has been identified.

- Overall, the budget for Component 2 seems high compared to the activities listed for a two year duration. Please clarify.

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The budget spans three years of project activities and covers CBIT annual meetings; therefore, it is significant in terms of workshops.

- Please comment on how this project will ensure good coordination on the part of UNDP and UNEP so that it is truly implemented jointly as one program as opposed to one program implemented by two agencies, which has been the case of the GSP.

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The proposed project will build on joint approach that has been established for the UNDP-UNEP CBIT Phase I project. The two implementing agencies (IAs) have formal mechanisms for coordinating the planning and implementation of project activities successfully.

The approach to planning is coordinated in the form of *shared work plans*. All project activities are designed with input from both agencies, regardless of which IA has been assigned the lead role.

The approach to integrated implementation is based on ongoing structured and routine communication. At present, the IAs meet in person twice a year to review project implementation and address operational issues and plan activities. Phone calls and e-mail communication between the IAs take place on a regular basis between these meetings.

UNDP/UNEP March 2021:

- Thank you for this additional explanation. We note that there were no additional details added to the output in the portal entry. We support the piloting of regional-level work in this IIA project so that the IIB project can be better informed; nevertheless, we find the definition of this activity within Output 2.2 to be unclear. It may be better to turn this activity into its own output, as it exists in the Phase IIB project. Thus, additional details could be provided at the level of activities, which would provide additional information to the expected breakdown of the \$100,000 budget allocated.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* Former activity 2.2.4 was upgraded into its own output (?Output 2.5: Fostering of south-south peer exchange in climate transparency actions in the LAC region piloted?). This output has been designed to: a) elaborate on the specific activities that will be undertaken as part of this regional pilot; b) explicitly inform the transition from phase IIA to IIB of the CBIT Global Platform in terms of regional and global exchange; c) integrate with on-going initiatives, avoiding duplication of efforts and adopting lessons learned from successful forerunners implemented by UNDP/UNEP, such as the RedINGEI; and d) capitalize on the experience gathered by UNDP/UNEP in the development of numerous country-specific CBIT projects in the region. The \$100,000 amount will be allocated to hire a part-time consultant during the three years of the project to perform these tasks.

Details on Output 2.5 are now provided in the project documentation under the discussion of project outputs and activities.

- Thank you for this additional explanation. We believe it would make more sense for this topic to be integrated across the different activities (online knowledge products under Component 1, global meetings, side events, regional south-south networks). Nevertheless, we understand that having a separate output for it makes the contracting of a gender expert. Is the expectation that in Phase IIB it would be mainstreamed as the "heavy lifting" would mostly be carried out in Phase IIA? How will the regional work be integrated with the proposed support for the south-south MRV networks, including the LAC pilot in Component 2?

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* Yes, the expectation is that gender work will be mainstreamed in Phase IIB. Under that project, the updated gender and MRV toolkit will provide a means of supporting countries, and the regional networks will also be used to disseminate good practice on gender mainstreaming in MRV. In the meantime, as described in the 24 April response, regional gender-related activities will be held in four regions under the Phase IIA project, and these meetings will be integrated into other events where possible in order to use resources efficiently.

- Overall, we find that there is a mismatch in terms of scope among the different outputs and the level of detail in the activities described, which has not been addressed in this resubmission. We urge the agencies to go through the outputs and activities to ensure a comparable level of detail and scope and to present how this project and the IIB project will fit together. We also urge the agencies to also incorporate how the ongoing pandemic might impact the planned activities. For example, it may necessitate a stronger focus on the online parts of the project and outreach. Already the meeting expected for this year has been postponed and the COP and SB meetings have also been postponed. How might this change the budget for these activities and how might the project adjust to this new reality? Please note that currently the project is expected to end in June 2023, which actually limits in person activities to two years.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* Section II.A.3 of the CEO ER now includes additional information on how the projects will fit together. Essentially, CBIT Phase II embodies a merger of two programs that provide assistance on country reporting to provide a "one-stop shop" for capacity development in transparency. The three key components are: 1) a unified website with essential, up-to-date materials; 2) peer support and opportunities provided through networks and events; and 3) a menu of capacity development options for countries that range from regional and global meetings to targeted trainings and on-call support.

At present, the Phase IIA project plans to schedule annual in-person meetings in September 2021, June 2022, and April 2023, which all fit within the allotted workplan schedule. In addition, the project will schedule a one-day workshop in February 2021 that will take place on-line. Additional funding for the on-line workshop will not be necessary.

Additional information on risk management related to the COVID-19 pandemic is provided in the description of Component 2 (Outputs 2.1 and 2.4) and in Section II.A.5 in Project Risks and Table 3 on Risks and Risk Mitigation Measures. The Project Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring and applying agency guidance related to the COVID-19 pandemic and on reporting to the PMU and EMG on necessary measures to ensure the safety of staff, contractors, and stakeholders participating in project activities.

- Comment not cleared. While the existing arrangements were successful for the initial set up of the platform, it was also chosen considering the ongoing GSP implementation. Now that we are entering a new phase with the closure/integration of the GSP, we urge the agencies to think about implementing different institutional arrangements that ensure

a more coordinated approach and further avoid direct execution if possible. We believe it may be necessary to have an overall project manager,/coordinator which would be the key representative for the program. If necessary, the GEF would be happy to discuss this matter further with the agencies.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* These comments have been taken into account, and both GEF implementing agencies have agreed to unified, overarching management arrangements that will provide continuity through Phase IIA and Phase IIB. These updated arrangements are described in Section II.A.6 of the CEO ER and Annex J.

#### **Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Please review whether PMC will have any co-financing.

6/30/2020: Co-financing for the PMC has been added. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: Project management costs will have co-financing of USD 50,000 from the total amount allocated for the project. Table B and Annex H2 have been changed accordingly.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Co-financing in-kind of \$400,000 from UNEP DTU Partnership has been identified as recurrent expenditures and confirmed. Cleared.

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Yes, although as we noted above, this project should be supported from the CBIT TF not from the CBIT Set-Aside in GEF-7. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Targeted beneficiaries have increased to 300. This target remains realistic. Cleared.

6/30/2020: Please add a description as to how this number was estimated in the space provided below the Core Indicators table.

We also note that we found the CBIT tracking tool had been filled out and included in the project document package, however those indicators do not apply to global projects. We believe there is an attribution issue to use the average of the CBIT country projects as a way to evaluate the impact of this global project. Please remove the tracking tool.

4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP/UNEP March 2021:

6/30/2020: Please add a description as to how this number was estimated in the space provided below the Core Indicators table.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* This description has been added under the Core Indicators table and Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request.

We also note that we found the CBIT tracking tool had been filled out and included in the project document package, however those indicators do not apply to global projects. We believe there is an attribution issue to use the average of the CBIT country projects as a way to evaluate the impact of this global project. Please remove the tracking tool.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* The CBIT tracking tool has been removed.

#### Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes, the project appears well justified, but address comments above.

#### Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: The baseline scenario is well presented. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/23/2019: Per comments provided in the review of the Global Phase II B, please make reference to the coupled projects as sequential not complementary. Furthermore, avoid using specific numbers of projects approved under the CBIT (better to round up/down or

use total indicative amounts of resources) in order to avoid having incorrect information. Also please see comments above.

6/30/2020: Thank you for addressing the comments above.

Additional information on how this project and Phase II B will fit together, beyond the timeline graphic, would be useful.

4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The text of the proposal has been modified on page 11 to address these comments and to ensure consistency with language used under the CBIT Phase IIB PIF.

UNDP/UNEP March 2021;

Additional information on how this project and Phase II B will fit together, beyond the timeline graphic, would be useful.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* The text has been modified and expanded to better explain the relationship between the two projects.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes, this is cleared.

#### Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes, this is cleared.

#### Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: This is a global capacity-building project, this its expected contributions to global environmental benefits are completely indirect. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: this is cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A. This is a global project.

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: The section on the role civil society will play in the project is missing. Please address.

6/30/2020: Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: Civil society will be involved in the project in several ways. First, the integrated platform will share best practices from CBIT national projects on how to integrate CSOs into national transparency activities. In addition, international NGOs (INGOs) such as the World Resources Institute, have participated in CBIT technical workshops during phase I, and will continue to do so, to contribute expertise and serve as a resource for country participants. The role of CSOs is now included in the text description of civil society involvement on page 24 and in Table 2 on key stakeholders (pages 24-26). The project intends to encourage the continued participation of relevant INGOs in technical workshops, COP side events, and other project-related meetings. Finally, the project will support the two-way exchange of information with regional and international CSOs that support gender equality and women's participation to inform the deliverables under Output 2.4, such as the European Institute for Gender Equality. This information is now included on page 24 of the CEO ER.

In addition, the project will work with CSOs that are involved with the transparency initiatives identified in the stakeholder overview in Table 2 on pages 24-6.

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes.

## Agency Response

### Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: yes.

## Agency Response

### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: yes.

6/30/2020: please add an assessment of the risk the current pandemic poses to the project and appropriate response measures.

4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNEP March 2021:

6/30/2020: please add an assessment of the risk the current pandemic poses to the project and appropriate response measures.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* Additional information on risk management related to the COVID-19 pandemic is provided in the description of Component 2 and Output 2.1 and in Section II.A.5 in Project Risks and Table 3 on Risks and Risk Mitigation Measures.

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes.

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: The project is global but will address national climate change priorities consistent with the Paris Agreement and countries' NDCs as it will build the capacity of countries' reporting.

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: yes.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/30/2020: ESS has been submitted as part of the project document package. The project has been assessed as having a low level of risk. Please enter the relevant information into the new section on the portal.

4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response  
UNDP/UNEP March 2021:

6/30/2020: ESS has been submitted as part of the project document package. The project has been assessed as having a low level of risk. Please enter the relevant information into the new section on the portal.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments: The information is entered into the new section on the portal.*

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: We note that audits were included in the M&E budget, when it should be part of the PMC. Please address.

6/30/2020: Audits have been moved under the PMC. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The cost of the audits has been moved to the Project Management Costs section of the project budget as presented in Annex H-1, and the component totals and budget notes have been adjusted accordingly. Audit costs have also been removed from the M&E Budget and Workplan in Annex I, and the total has been adjusted accordingly.

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Yes.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Please address the following comments regarding the budget and work plan for the project:

- We note that the Project Management Cost is meant to support day-to-day activities, procurement and delivery of inputs and outputs. This should include the Audit currently under the M&E budget, and the cost of the Project Coordinator, project assistant, procurement specialist, financial specialist, etc. Some of these seems to be under the costs for Component 2. Please revise.

6/30/2020: See comment above on institutional arrangements as this issue may be addressed through those changes.



4/2/2021: Comments above have been addressed.

4/12/2021: Regarding the budget, we note that there is a line item named "UNDP Direct Support Service" for \$18,000. Please provide additional details and justification for this expense that is to go directly to UNDP as one of the execution agencies (as well as implementing agencies) for this project. It does not seem appropriate to have such a line item in a global project. If these expenses support specific eligible execution activities carried out by a procurement specialist; and/or financial specialist perhaps the staff time and associated TORs can be provided.

4/20/2021: Comment above has been addressed.

### Agency Response

UNDP, UNEP, 24/04/2020: The budget has been revised taking out administrative support costs from Component 2 and charging them to PMC. Under Component 2, some budget lines have been maintained to cover the costs of the project coordinator, as he/she will implement strictly technical work directly related to the component outputs. UNDP considers this approach to be more effective rather than having all technical work done by external consultants. This approach follows the same strategy used under GSP and CBIT Global Coordination Platform, which had been approved and validated by GEF. As an example, project manager costs were indeed included in Components 2 and 3, as clearly shown in Annex F1 of the CEO endorsement package of CBIT GCP and formally approved by GEF in 2017. This successful case, which has been instrumental to the success of both projects, is being replicated in this proposal. This dual role is now clarified under the Terms of Reference for the Project Coordinator in Annex G on page 51.

Additionally, the audit has been moved under PMC. Please refer to Annex H-1.

### UNDP/UNEP March 2021:

6/30/2020: See comment above on institutional arrangements as this issue may be addressed through those changes.

*Response to 6/30/2020 Comments:* A revised description of project implementation arrangements is now provided in Section II.A.6 and Annex J of the CEO Endorsement Request, the budget has been revised accordingly.

### Response to the comment from 4/12/2021:

The budget line item will cover 12% of a Financial Specialist, to be based in the Istanbul Regional Hub. The duties of the Financial Specialist with regards to the project will include financial documentation and record keeping, payment facilitation, and support for audits, budget reviews, project expenditure reports, and other financial reporting for project management.

The work of the financial specialist and the time allocated is now noted in the budget notes of the CEO ER (page 70), and the UNDP ProDoc (page 47).

The ToRs for the Financial Specialist are now provided on page 68 of the UNDP ProDoc.

## **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Yes

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Yes

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/3/2021: Agency to update submission and ProDoc per Council comments.

7/6/2021: Council comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Council comments - US Council member (26 May and 29 June 2021):

We have a series of technical recommendations we would recommend, noted below. In addition, we noticed the document was out of date, including many references to reports expected in 2020 and COP25, which have already occurred.

### **Comment # 1**

(26 May 2021)

On page 7, the project document states "In addition to reporting commitments under Articles 4.1 and 12.1 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Durban Outcomes (1/CP.16) and Cancun Agreements (2.CP.17), and Article 13 of the Paris Agreement (PA), countries are to submit revised Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) in 2020, followed by a subsequent revised NDC in 2025. It should be noted that progress in reporting under these agreements varies widely among developing countries. There are countries that have produced several national communications (NCs) and several biennial update reports (BURs), while other countries have yet to produce a BUR. All of these countries now face additional reporting under Article 13." We would like to note that the PA reporting requirements supersede the requirements for stand-alone NCs and for BURs; the PA does not add additional reporting requirements.

(29 June 2021)

For comment #1 re: "additional reporting" - we appreciate the agency response and the edits in the ProDoc.

**Comment #2**

(26 May 2021)

Further on page 7, the project document states "Likewise, National Communications are still part of the UNFCCC reporting process and will continue to require support." We would like to note that the BTR, with three additional chapters, serves the NC function. This does not require parallel support.

(29 June 2021)

For comment #2: re: NC and BTR parallel support - while it is technically true that the MPGs do not replace the NC reporting guidelines for Annex I and non-Annex I, as phrased in the ProDoc it implies that NCs as a stand-alone report are still required and will be supported by the GEF.

Our understanding is that the GEF will provide support every 4 years for the cost of the additional 3 chapters that may be added on to a BTR to fulfill the NC reporting requirements (see below), not that the GEF will continue to pay the full costs for a stand alone NC AND a BTR, as the phrasing implies.

We suggest at a minimum rephrasing the language to read: "Likewise, National Communications are still part of the UNFCCC reporting process, including when submitted as a single report with the BTR in accordance with decision 1/CP24, and the additional NC chapters required will continue to require support."

See decision 1/CP24 para 43:

43. Further decides that, with respect to the reporting and review of national communications under the Convention every four years, starting from the date that reports are first due under the Paris Agreement: (a) Parties may submit their national communication and biennial transparency report as a single report in accordance with the modalities, procedures and guidelines included in the annex to decision -/CMA.1 for information also covered by the national communication reporting guidelines contained in, as applicable, decisions 4/CP.5 and 17/CP.8; (b) In addition, Parties shall include in the report: (i) Supplemental chapters on research and systematic observation and on education, training and public awareness, in accordance with the guidelines contained in, as applicable, decisions 4/CP.5 and 17/CP.8; (ii) For those Parties that have not reported under chapter IV of the annex to decision -/CMA.1, an additional chapter on adaptation, in accordance with

**Comment #3**

(26 May 2021)

Page 9 mentions "This CBIT Phase II project is consistent with the Paris Agreement and national priorities, such as national communications, BURs, and NDCs tracking." However, BURs do not exist under the PA framework, and the last BURs are to be submitted by 2024. We recommend deleting this reference to BUR in this sentence for accuracy.

(29 June 2021)

For comment #3 re: BURs and the Paris Agreement - we agree with the agency response on the timing, but the BUR is not part of the PA framework, and our initial comment was driven by trying to add clarity to the sentence.

We suggest a slight revision: "This CBIT Phase II project is consistent with the Paris Agreement, and with national priorities, such as national communications, BURs, and NDCs tracking."

#### UNDP RESPONSE 1 July 2021:

##### **Comment #1**

The phrase "additional reporting" was meant to convey the broader scope of the reporting requirements under the BTR as opposed to the BUR for NAI / Developing Country Parties (e.g. reporting on the progress a Party has made towards implementing and/or achieving its NDC) rather than imply that additional reports would be required.

Wording for timing on NDC submissions and PA reporting from 2020 and COP meetings has been updated in the ProDoc and CEO ER.

The sentence on page 7 (ProDoc) and page 8 (CEO ER) that mentions additional reporting has been removed to avoid confusion.

##### **Comment #2**

Current guidance from the UNFCCC states the following:

"The MPGs do not replace the NC reporting guidelines for Annex I and non-Annex I Parties under the Convention. Accordingly, developed countries are required to submit an NC every four years (2/CP.17, para. 14) and developing countries should submit an NC every four years (1/CP.16, para. 60(b)).

"Once the MPGs are in effect, and taking the mandated timelines into account, Parties to the PA may:

? Continue to report a separate NC every 4 years, following the guidelines in 17/CP.8 or 4/CP.5 (to be updated by 6/CP.25) as appropriate OR

? May choose to submit a single BTR/NC report in the years an NC is submitted, following the guidance in the MPGs for BTRs and including supplemental chapters on research and systematic observations (RSO) and education/training and public awareness following the guidelines in 4/CP.5 (to be updated by 6/CP.25) and 17/CP.8, as appropriate (para. 43 of 1/CP.24). In addition, Parties that have not reported information on adaptation in section IV of the BTR must also include an additional chapter on adaptation, in accordance with the relevant guidelines in 4/CP.5 (to be updated by 6/CP.25) and 17/CP.8, as appropriate (para. 43 of 1/CP.24).?

[Source: UNFCCC (2021). FAQs on the Operationalization of the Enhanced Transparency Framework:p. 9]

The option of parallel support for NCs is offered in this project for countries that might elect to continue to submit a separate NC as permitted under current guidance.

As per additional discussion, the text on page 6 of the ProDoc and on page 8 of the CEO ER has been amended to read ?Likewise, National Communications are still part of the UNFCCC reporting process, including when submitted as a single report with the BTR in accordance with decision 1/CP24, and the additional NC chapters required will continue to require support.

### **Comment #3**

As the project will begin in 2021, the first three years of its implementation will coincide with the preparation of the final BURs for a number of Non Annex I countries, and it is important that the project scope allow it to provide technical support and expertise to countries in meeting that reporting obligation.

As per additional discussion, the text on page 8 of the ProDoc and page 38 of the CEO ER has been amended to read ?This CBIT Phase II project is consistent with the Paris Agreement, and with national priorities, such as national communications, BURs, and NDCs tracking.?

### **STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

### **Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/23/2019: Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/a global project

Agency Response  
**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2019: Not yet, please address comments above.

6/30/2020: Not yet, please address comments above.

4/12/2021: Please address additional comment on the budget.

4/20/2021: Comments addressed. PM recommends CEO Endorsement.

7/3/2021: Agency to update submission and ProDoc per Council comments.

7/6/2021: Council comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO endorsement.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/23/2019</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/30/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/2/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/12/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/20/2021</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**