Climate Transparency Global Support Programme III (Climate Transparency-GSP III)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11880
Countries
Global
Project Name
Climate Transparency Global Support Programme III (Climate Transparency-GSP III)
Agencies
UNEP, UNDP
Date received by PM
5/22/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Saba Kalam
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
6/25/2026

Cleared

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/25/2026

Cleared

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
8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

The project summary would benefit from providing a brief articulation of the achievements and lessons learned from GSP-1 and GSP-2, as it currently lacks sufficient context regarding the evolution of the programme.

1. Include key achievements and outcomes from GSP-1 and GSP-2.
2. Identify remaining gaps and challenges that justify GSP-3.
3. Explain how GSP-3 builds on and scales up previous results.
4. Clarify the added value and strategic rationale for GSP-3.
5. Describe how the global project supports and complements national projects.
6. Highlight synergies, knowledge sharing, and economies of scale between global and national interventions.

Agency Response
07/13/2026

The summary has been revised to include achievements and lessons from GSP-1 and GSP-2, remaining gaps and challenges that justify GSP-3, the rationale and added value of GSP-3, including how it scales up previous results and strengthens synergies, knowledge sharing, and complementarity between global programme and national interventions.

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

8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

3 a) Cleared

3 b) Please look at all the outputs. Outputs should be the immediate, tangible deliverables of a task or process.

Output 1.2 is framed very broadly around the IPCC software and could be expanded to include inventory methodologies, QA/QC, and other technical resources relevant to the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF).

Output 1.4 is primarily communication oriented and can have more quantifiable aspects.

Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 overlap significantly and could potentially be merged.

Output 2.1: Access to networks is a non-quantifiable output; the focus should be on active engagement, knowledge exchange, and application of learning.

3 c) Cleared

3 d) The cofinancing PMC contribution is 11%. whereas the cofinancing to the project is nearly 18%. Please make it consistent.

3 e) PMC is 5%.

Agency Response

07/13/2026

3 b)

Output 1.2: Kindly note that Output 1.2 and Annex R were intentionally designed to focus on the development, maintenance, and modernization of the IPCC Inventory Software and related user documentation, as agreed during project design discussions with IGES/IPCC TFI TSU and the GEF Secretariat. The broader areas highlighted by GEF, such as inventory methodologies, QA/QC, and other ETF-related technical resources, are addressed under Outputs 1.1 and 1.3 through the development and dissemination of technical knowledge products.

In addition, Output 1.2 supports knowledge transfer and country uptake through technical assistance, coordination with regional transparency initiatives, and feedback mechanisms that inform ongoing software improvements. Additional text has been included to clarify

that this output also responds directly to Parties? requests to maintain alignment between inventory preparation and ETF reporting tools.

Output 1.4: The wording of the output?s title has been revised to ?Programme identity, communication, advocacy and coordination mechanisms strengthened to support dissemination and accessibility of climate-transparency knowledge? to focus on the concrete elements within it. In addition, a new quantifiable target has been added under Annex C (Indicator 1.4.b): at least 10 communication and outreach materials (e.g., videos, social media content, event-focused digital artifacts) to be produced and disseminated over the project duration, complementing the existing target on global events and coordination meetings (Indicator 1.4.a).

Outputs 2.1 and 2.2: Thank you for the suggestion. In response, Component 2 has been restructured to improve clarity. The revised outputs cover: (i) strengthening regional and language-based transparency networks for capacity-building, knowledge exchange, and coordination; (ii) piloting and documenting a tailored support package for SIDS for replication in other SIDS and LDCs; and (iii) providing targeted, gender-responsive technical assistance to improve climate reporting and national transparency systems. This revision emphasizes active engagement, capacity development, and technical support rather than network access alone.

These outputs have been restructured, to improve clarity. Revised output 2.1 includes all work related to Regional Networks, whereas all work related to the SIDS/LDCs support package is now the scope of (revised) output 2.2.

3 d)

Thank you for the comment. We have reviewed the PMC allocation and confirm that it is consistent with the proportionality principle in the GEF Project and Program Cycle Guidelines. Approximately 5% of the GEF grant is allocated to PMC, compared to approximately 11% of the co-financing. Therefore, the co-financing allocates a greater share of its resources to project management than the GEF grant, and the GEF is not bearing a disproportionate share of PMC costs. We understand the comment may compare the share of co-financing in PMC with the overall project co-financing ratio; however, the proportionality principle is intended to ensure that GEF resources do not finance a disproportionate share of project management costs. On this basis, we consider the current allocation to be consistent with the Guidelines and propose no changes.

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
8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

The project rationale should present a clearer and more structured case for the global value proposition, the continued needs of developing countries, and the need and complementarity with national projects.

It should begin by outlining the growing and evolving reporting requirements under the ETF, including BTRs, NIDs, adaptation reporting, and support tracking, as well as the prospective revision of the MPGs in 2028. Against this backdrop, the rationale should explain the persistent capacity constraints faced by developing countries in meeting these obligations, including needs that go beyond the scope of existing national projects.

It should then clarify how the global programme complements and supports national CBIT and ETF projects, while also providing support to countries that do not have dedicated national projects. In doing so, the rationale should highlight the importance of moving from project-based reporting arrangements to more institutionalized and sustainable transparency systems. Finally, it should engage more concretely with the challenges identified in the BTR synthesis report and explain how the proposed outputs will help address those specific gaps.

Agency Response

07/13/2026

The project rationale has been revised and restructured to better articulate the evolving requirements of the ETF and the continued needs of developing countries. The section ?Introduction: Climate Transparency as a Global System? now discusses BTRs, NIDs, adaptation reporting, support tracking, and the implications of the anticipated MPG revision in 2028. A new section, ?ETF: Progress and Outstanding Challenges,? highlights persistent capacity and institutional gaps that extend beyond the scope of national projects. In addition, the section ?The Case for a Global Support Programme? clarifies the programme?s value-added and complementarity with national CBIT projects and enabling activities, including support for countries without dedicated national projects and the transition toward more institutionalized and sustainable transparency systems. The rationale has also been strengthened to link challenges identified in the BTR synthesis report with the proposed project outputs and support modalities.

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
8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

5.1 The Theory of Change may need to be revisited. Given that UNDP and UNEP manage one of the largest portfolios of CBIT and enabling activity projects, the assertion that ?BTRs remain uneven in quality, completeness and comparability? may require further nuance and substantiation. In addition, Parties are expected to report through the common reporting tables (CRTs) and common tabular formats (CTFs), which are designed to enhance consistency and comparability across submissions. The reference to ?weak climate governance? also merits clarification: if this challenge is to be addressed primarily through national projects, the distinct value-added and role of the global project should be more clearly articulated.

Agency Response
07/13/2026

The Theory of Change has been revised for consistency and completeness. The barrier analysis has also been strengthened to better substantiate the remaining challenges affecting the quality, completeness, and consistency of BTR submissions and the factors contributing to these gaps. In addition, a new section, ?The Case for a Global Support Programme,? has been added to the rationale to clarify the distinct value-added of the global project and its complementarity with national CBIT projects, enabling activities, and other existing support modalities

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
8/1/2026

Cleared. Manager's approval uploaded.

6/25/2026

1. Dual role by UNDP and UNEP: please follow the GEF Guidelines and include an explicit statement seeking an exception waiver for the dual implementation and execution roles as follows:

PROCESS FOR AGENCIES SEEKING AN EXCEPTION WAIVER FOR DUAL IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION ROLES

14. Agencies that intend to undertake a dual implementation and execution role for a GEF project must abide by the following steps:

(a) The GEF Agency must consult with the relevant GEF Secretariat program manager in writing before seeking OFP support. This consultation must occur at least six months before CEO Endorsement/Approval.

(b) The formal written consultation for an exception waiver shall include the rationale for the Agency dual role with the following elements:

(i) A statement clarifying which of the five exception waivers the Agency is pursuing;

(ii) Specific execution activities to be performed by the Agency, along with the timeline for those execution activities;

(iii) A statement confirming that cost recovery for the Agency assuming a dual role shall not be recovered from GEF resources, recalling that any costs incurred by the Agency performing execution services, including capacity building of the EA, are to be covered by the co-financing resources allocated to the project management cost estimated as part of the total project cost;

(iv) A depiction of possible alternatives for EAs that have executed GEF projects in the participant country/countries, and an explanation why none of the alternatives are feasible, including for countries/contexts in which GEF Agencies have previously implemented projects with the nominated EA without a dual role; and

(v) Description of the governance, decision-making processes, and institutional arrangements for the Agency to safeguard a clear separation of implementation and execution duties and related authorizations.

Agency Response
07/13/2026

In accordance with GEF guidelines, the GEF Secretariat was notified of the proposed dual execution arrangement. Approval for the dual execution modality was received from the GEF Secretariat on 11 February 2026 and has been uploaded as supporting documentation. Furthermore, the project document has been updated to include an explicit justification for the dual execution arrangement and the associated exception request, which is now reflected under the Institutional Arrangements section.

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
6/25/2026

Cleared.

Agency Response
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
6/25/2026

Cleared

Agency Response
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 RequestNA

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
6/25/2026

Cleared. The project is aligned with GEF-8 CCM Objective 2 priorities.

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
6/25/2026

The programme is designed to respond to needs and priorities identified by developing countries in implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) under the Paris Agreement.

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 RequestNA

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

The role of IGES in the below section needs to be included

Select what role civil society will play in the Project

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body ;

Executor or co-executor; No

Other (Please explain) Yes

Agency Response

07/13/2026

Kindly note that IGES is officially a Public Interest Incorporated Foundation, a specific type of non-profit legal entity under Japanese law. It is an intergovernmental research institute that functions more as a technical/scientific body than a civil society organization. It will serve as the third co-executing agency, leading Output 1.2 on the IPCC Software. Civil society engagement will be ensured through technical collaboration, peer-to-peer learning, regional capacity-building activities, communities of practice, pilot interventions, and knowledge-sharing. This has been reflected in Section C (Stakeholder Engagement) of the project document. Unfortunately, it was not possible to

provide this explanation directly in the GEF Portal, as the ?Other? category does not generate a pop-up text field where the Agency can enter additional information/explanation.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/25/2026

Cleared. Gender Action Plan uploaded

Agency Response
7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/25/2026

Cleared. Stakeholder Engagement Plan uploaded

Agency Response
7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/25/2026

Cleared. SRIF uploaded

Agency Response
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
6/25/2026

Cleared. The proposed GEF financing, inclusive of the Agency fee, is fully in line with applicable GEF policies, guidelines, and established financial parameters. The total project financing requested from the GEF Trust Fund will be funded through CCM CBIT Set-Aside resources. The Agency fee, calculated in accordance with the GEF's standardized fee structure, falls within the permissible range as stipulated in GEF policy.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/25/2026

This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside (CCM Objective 2). The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/25/2026

This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside (CCM Objective 2). The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

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
6/25/2026

Cleared. Details of the PPG expenditure provided in Annex D.

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
6/25/2026

This is a global project.

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
6/25/2026

Cleared.

Agency Response

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
6/25/2026

Not Applicable. This is a global project.

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
6/25/2026

Not Applicable. This is a global project.

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 RequestNot Applicable. This is a global project.

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

8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

- Depending on the changes suggested in the outputs, the targets and indicators may change.

- In its current form the result framework needs to be strengthened on following aspects, as these are the barriers highlighted to be addressed in the project document.

1. There is no indicator indicating that countries improved the quality of their reports.
2. There is no indicator demonstrating that countries applied the methodologies or tools provided.
3. There is no indicator showing that countries institutionalized these practices within national systems.
4. There is no indicator demonstrating that the support improved the completeness, timeliness, or quality of BTRs/NCs.

Release plan available; event planner; workplan approved by JPMU; pilot documentation: These cant be target indicators. Please make it more concrete.

Agency Response

07/13/2026

While the observations are acknowledged, the proposed indicators would measure higher level country outcomes that fall outside the direct scope, mandate, and accountability of the GSP. The programme is not designed to assess and verify the quality of national reports, as report quality is determined by national circumstances, country owned processes, and the iterative review and improvement mechanisms established under the UNFCCC ETF. Consequently, indicators that seek to measure improvements in report quality, application of methodologies at the national level, institutionalization of practices, or enhancements in the completeness, timeliness and quality of Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) and National Communications (NCs) would attribute outcomes to the programme that are beyond its direct sphere of control and accountability.

As the programme is designed to provide technical support, capacity building services, tools, guidance and knowledge sharing opportunities to assist countries in meeting ETF reporting requirements, some amendments have been made where feasible to provide more clarity on the outputs and immediate outcomes that are directly attributable to GSP support, such as the provision of technical assistance, development and dissemination of tools and guidance, capacity development activities, and strengthened technical capacities of participating countries:

? **On indicators for improved report quality:** Indicator 2.3.b ("number of transparency reports reviewed") has been included in the results framework, recognizing that these reviews contribute to countries' efforts to strengthen reporting quality through established UNFCCC processes.

? **On indicators for application of methodologies or tools:** the objective-level indicator (Indicator 1: "number of developing countries that report using GSP support in their BTR/NC submissions") has been included to track dissemination and uptake of GSP-developed tools, templates, and knowledge products, directly monitoring how these resources are utilized by participating countries. The Transparency Platform will also be used, where possible, to monitor access to and utilization of these resources by countries.

? **On indicators for institutionalization:** The Transparency Platform will track change reported by countries over time on institutional arrangement levels based on the GEF CBIT ranking framework in their CBIT projects. This tracking is intended to provide information on broader trends in country transparency systems beyond the project period and should not be interpreted as evidence of outcomes directly attributable to GSP support but rather as indicative of wider country driven progress under the ETF.

? Finally, regarding process-based mid-term targets, the indicators 1.2, 1.3, 1.4.a, and 2.2 have been revised to reflect substantive interim milestones rather than planning steps, as highlighted in the Annex C: Project results framework.

Please note that the approach taken to the indicators of this project is a common approach for global projects and builds upon experiences of global coordination projects of other global programmes and integrated programmes (see for example 11098). This is similar to the understanding that global coordination projects of global and integrated programmes do not achieve GEBs ? they are one step before this in terms of causality. A global coordination project is essential an enabler, it does not lead to behavioural change or GEBs at the national level ? that is beyond its reach of influence and is achieved by national projects. Beyond this logicality, it also ensures avoidance of double counting.

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
8/1/2026

Cleared

6/25/2026

Under Annex E, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field. This includes the Location Name, Latitude and Longitude. Geolocation information. For Global or coordination projects, agencies are encouraged to include the geographic location of any physical project activity (such as event or knowledge sharing activity), to ensure the project is visible. In the case of a program, Agencies may enter at least the country or capital city of the country of countries participating in the program.

Agency Response
07/13/2026
Given the global scope of the project, it is not possible to identify a single specific geographic location at this stage. Annex P provides maps illustrating the regional networks covered under the project. In line with the suggestion to include the geographic location of physical project activities (such as events or knowledge-sharing activities) to enhance project visibility, Copenhagen, Denmark has been included as the location of the GSP Knowledge Platform (https://climate-transparency-platform.org/) ? a key physical hub associated with project implementation while acknowledging the project?s global reach.

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
8/20/2026

The comments are cleared. However, the Agency has copied the budget table twice in Annex G, which should be corrected prior to sending the project for clearance.

8/6/2026

1. The explanation provided in the review sheet regarding total personnel costs, including contractual services to individuals and staff costs, is helpful and generally acceptable. However, since these costs still represent 51% of the project budget, the initial concern is not fully addressed. Please further clarify how duplication is avoided, specifically between the ?Senior Transparency Officers? and ?Transparency Officers?, as the TORs appear to include very similar functions related to knowledge products, technical assistance, training, quality review, and reporting.

11. Salary and benefits/Staff Costs		**$ 757,936**	**$ 802,087**	**$ 1,560,023**	**$ 193,437**	**$ 410,571**	**$ 2,164,031**	
Technical Coordinator and Advisor (UNEP)	1 position. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 11,398	$ 11,398	$ 22,796	$ 27,862	$ 93,343	$ 144,001	UNEP-CCC
Technical Coordinator and Advisor (UNDP)	1 position. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 72,714	$ 90,892	$ 163,606	$ 18,178	$ 131,780	$ 313,564	UNDP Planet Hub
Senior Transparency Officer (UNEP)	1 position. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 63,000	$ 72,000	$ 135,000	$ 45,000		$ 180,000	UNEP-CCC
Senior Transparency Officer (UNDP)	1 position. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 147,693	$ 204,924	$ 352,617	$ 16,615		$ 369,232	UNDP Planet Hub
Transparency officers (UNEP base team)	3 positions. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 270,000	$ 270,000	$ 540,000			$ 540,000	UNEP-CCC
Transparency officers (UNDP base team)	3 positions. Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 163,131	$ 128,873	$ 292,004	$ 34,258		$ 326,262	UNDP Planet Hub
Communications, KM and gender officer (UNEP)	Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency	$ 30,000	$ 24,000	$ 54,000	$ 6,000		$ 60,000	UNEP-CCC
Communications, KM and gender officer (UNDP)	Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency							UNDP Planet Hub
Administrative and financial support (UNEP)	Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency				$ 27,000	$ 153,000	$ 180,000	UNEP-CCC
Administrative and financial support (UNDP)	Detailed TORs available in Annex I of the CEO ER. Amounts may differ due to available co-finance from each agency				$ 18,524	$ 32,448	$ 50,972	UNDP Planet Hub

2. On travel costs, which still represent 25% of the project budget, the explanation in the review sheet is helpful and generally acceptable. However, the budget lines remain highly aggregated. Please provide a more detailed breakdown of the travel budget by major category, consistent with the activities described in the review sheet.

6/25/2026

The budget is not clear, we request a separate excel sheet with all the details of each heading and breakdown of associated cost.

1. Total personnel costs (including contractual services to individuals and staff costs) account for 51% of the project budget, which is very high. Please streamline and consolidate positions e.g. coordination (4 positions) and admin and finance positions (2), as well as transparency positions (4). Please explain what are Ad-hoc experts are supposed to deliver.

	Component 1	Component 2		M&E	PMC			
GEF budget category & detailed description	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Subtotal	M&E	PMC	Total	Responsible entity	
Software & communication licenses (UNEP)	$352	$2,648	$3,000			$3,000	UNEP-CCC	
Software & communication licenses (UNDP)	$500	$2,500	$3,000			$3,000	UNDP Planet Hub	
Mid Term Review (MTR)				$22,500		$22,500	UNDP Planet Hub	
Terminal Evaluation				$37,500		$37,500	UNEP-CCC	
08. Contractual services (individuals)	**$777,517**	**$1,687,454**	**$2,464,971**			**$2,464,971**		27%
Network coordinators (UNEP)	$195,271	$704,729	$900,000			$900,000	UNEP-CCC	
Network coordinators (UNDP)	$195,271	$704,729	$900,000			$900,000	UNDP Planet Hub	
IT specialist	$108,000		$108,000			$108,000	UNEP-CCC	
Ad-hoc experts (UNEP)	$113,357	$156,643	$270,000			$270,000	UNEP-CCC	
Ad-hoc experts (UNDP)	$84,618	$121,353	$205,971			$205,971	UNDP Planet Hub	
Visual designer (UNEP)	$54,000		$54,000			$54,000	UNEP-CCC	
Visual designer (UNDP)	$27,000		$27,000			$27,000	UNDP Planet Hub	
11. Salary and benefits/Staff Costs	**$757,936**	**$802,087**	**$1,560,023**	**$193,437**	**$410,571**	**$2,164,031**		24%
Technical Coordinator and Advisor (UNEP)	$11,398	$11,398	$22,796	$27,862	$93,343	$144,001	UNEP-CCC	
Technical Coordinator and Advisor (UNDP)	$72,714	$90,892	$163,606	$18,178	$131,780	$313,564	UNDP Planet Hub	
Senior Transparency Officer (UNEP)	$63,000	$72,000	$135,000	$45,000		$180,000	UNEP-CCC	
Senior Transparency Officer (UNDP)	$147,693	$204,924	$352,617	$16,615		$369,232	UNDP Planet Hub	
Transparency officers (UNEP base team)	$270,000	$270,000	$540,000			$540,000	UNEP-CCC	
Transparency officers (UNDP base team)	$163,131	$128,873	$292,004	$34,258		$326,262	UNDP Planet Hub	
Communications, KM and gender officer (UNEP)	$30,000	$24,000	$54,000	$6,000		$60,000	UNEP-CCC	
Communications, KM and gender officer (UNDP)							UNDP Planet Hub	
Administrative and financial support (UNEP)				$27,000	$153,000	$180,000	UNEP-CCC	
Administrative and financial support (UNDP)				$18,524	$32,448	$50,972	UNDP Planet Hub	
12. Training, Workshops, Meetings	**$43,672**	**$574,025**	**$617,697**	**$5,000**		**$622,697**		7%
Inception workshop				$5,000		$5,000	UNEP-CCC	

2. Travel cost at 25% of the project budget is also relative higher than other projects. Please provide more details and justification for such high travel cost and please scale down as much as possible.

Agency Response

08/25/2026

Apologies for the duplication of the budget table. The corrected table has been uploaded in Annex G.

08/14/2026

Kindly note that the roles of the Senior Transparency Officers (STOs) and Transparency Officers (TOs) are clearly differentiated and do not duplicate one another. While both contribute to the same technical areas, their responsibilities are complementary. STOs serve as senior technical leads, providing technical guidance, ensuring methodological consistency, resolving complex technical issues, and overseeing quality assurance. TOs, in contrast, are responsible for the technical production, implementation support, and delivery of project activities under the direction of the STOs. Where both contribute to the same workplan element, the STO is accountable for technical oversight and quality, while the TO supports implementation and delivery. This distinction is reflected in the TORs, qualification requirements, and experience

levels, with STOs requiring a minimum of seven years of relevant experience and demonstrated technical leadership, compared with three years for TOs.

The use of both senior and non-senior technical personnel is intentional and cost-efficient. TOs undertake the majority of technical production and delivery work, while one STO per stream provides oversight, quality assurance, and strategic technical direction. This pairing is also necessary given the scale of the project and the number of countries to be supported across the regional networks. The volume and diversity of country requests require sufficient technical capacity for day-to-day delivery, while maintaining senior level oversight to ensure methodological consistency and quality across the portfolio. The STO?TO structure therefore enables the project to manage a substantial country support workload efficiently, without requiring senior-level personnel to undertake routine technical production and implementation tasks. This model, successfully applied under CBIT GSP II, ensures high quality and consistent outputs without requiring all technical work to be performed by senior level personnel.

More broadly, the project has been structured to prevent duplication across all personnel and project resources through a direct mapping of the detailed workplan to the budget. Each workplan action or deliverable is assigned to a single accountable resource within each agency stream, while any additional personnel or consultants contributing to that activity are identified as supporting resources. This creates a clear division of responsibilities and prevents multiple resources from being independently accountable for the same output.

The revised budget package uploaded includes a workplan spreadsheet that identifies, for every workplan element, the responsible resource, supporting resources, and any related contracts. The spreadsheet can also be filtered to show the workplan associated with each position, consultancy, or budget line, providing a transparent and auditable link between project resources and assigned tasks. This enables any potential overlap to be identified and addressed at the PPG stage and demonstrates that resource allocations, including those of STOs and TOs, are complementary rather than duplicative.

2. Budget lines related to travel have now been broken down to provide more clarity. Kindly refer to the revised version of the budget uploaded with this revision.

07/13/2026

The excel version of the budget has been uploaded into the portal and now includes a 'Notes & comments' column providing a description of the planned costs for each budget line. Kindly note that Annex I (?Project contracting?) in the CEO Endorsement Request includes terms of reference for all key expenditures. Likewise, key expenditures are discussed for each output (refer to the section ?key procurement processes? under each of the project?s outputs).

1. **Personnel Costs:** The personnel structure reflects the global and demand driven nature of the GSP, which operates across 146 countries through 10 regional networks. The programme is designed around (i) a small core team, comprising per funding stream one Technical Coordinator and Advisor overseeing five regional networks (approximately 70 countries), one Senior Transparency Officer, and three Transparency Officers, supported by (ii) regional network coordinators each supporting an average of 15 countries, who provide tailored assistance across different regions, languages and time zones, and the (iii) specialized ad-hoc experts who are short-term specialists engaged on a demand driven basis to respond to specific country requests requiring expertise beyond that available within the

core team & regional coordinators, such as specialized sectoral inventory methodologies, Article 6 accounting, loss and damage metrics, or language specific support or when a temporary surge in regional workload exceeds a coordinator's capacity. This flexible resourcing model enables the programme to respond efficiently to country needs while avoiding the cost of maintaining a larger permanent team. The approach was successfully applied under CBIT GSP II and will continue under CBIT GSP III, ensuring continuity of regional support. Feedback from participating countries has consistently highlighted direct technical assistance and peer to peer learning as key success factors.

It is also important to note that this is a global knowledge and capacity building programme with an established IT infrastructure in place, costs of personal will naturally be most significant, as the development of knowledge products, as well as the diffusion of this knowledge, essentially depends on intellectual effort. Unlike country projects, it does not involve pilot activities, infrastructure development, or major equipment purchases. Instead, its main outputs depend on technical expertise, knowledge development, and knowledge sharing. As a result, personnel and technical expertise constitute the principal delivery mechanism of the programme.

2. **Travel Cost:** The travel allocation reflects the global nature of the GSP, which provides technical support and capacity-building services to 146 developing countries across all regions. Travel costs are an integral component of the programme design, which builds on the impactful modalities successfully implemented under CBIT GSP II, particularly regional and global peer-learning, knowledge exchange and capacity-building among countries implementing the ETF. Unlike projects implemented primarily within a single country, the GSP delivers its outputs through regional and in-country technical engagement, peer-learning exchanges, regional training workshops, Global technical forums, coordination with regional partners, and direct support to countries. As such, travel represents a core programme delivery cost rather than an administrative expense. The project document specifies minimum thresholds of one global event (the Global Transparency Forum), at least one in-person regional event per network per year (20 events over the project duration), and at least eight in country missions per network per year (160 missions over two years, reaching an estimated 4,000 participants), as reflected in the Results Framework (Annex C). This calibration reflects Decision 21/CMA.6 (Baku, 2024), which recognized that in-person, hands-on training is more effective in practice for ETF capacity-building.

These costs cover not only programme staff (core team, regional network coordinators and ad hoc experts) but also participation of country representatives and experts, whose engagement is essential to ensuring effective knowledge sharing, South - South cooperation, and dissemination of practical experience and lessons learned. Experience from previous phases has demonstrated that countries place high value on in-person regional exchanges and learning events, which significantly enhance capacity development and network-building. The budget has been developed to balance cost-efficiency with the need to ensure

meaningful country participation, while maximizing opportunities for regional delivery and leveraging virtual modalities wherever feasible.

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 RequestNA

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**6/25/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**8/1/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**8/20/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		