



# Cuban First and Second Biennial Transparency Reports and Forth National Communcation (1BTR + 2BTR&4NC)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11311

**Countries**

Cuba

**Project Name**

Cuban First and Second Biennial Transparency Reports and Forth National Communcation (1BTR + 2BTR&4NC)

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

6/30/2023

**Review completed by PM**

7/11/2023

**Program Manager**

Toshiyuki Yamasaki

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

EA

## Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

### Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

**Funding elements.**

**Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Yes.** This project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal area strategy.

Agency's Comments

**Cost Ranges.**

**If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Cleared.** The project has no deviations in the cost range. The costing is in line with Information Note GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency's Comments

**Enabling activity summary.**

**Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?**

## Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 8/17/2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**No.** Please address the following comments:

### -MRV system

From the proposal it is unclear whether there is an existing MRV system in place, i.e. ?options should be proposed to implement an MRV system?, ?unavailability of the MRV system?, etc. Please clarify whether there is indeed an existing MRV system in place or not, and what the role of the proposed project in designing a new/improving the MRV system.

### -CBIT

The proposal acknowledges the coordination with the on-going GEF-funded CBIT project ID 9970 currently under implementation by FAO and executed by the Ministry of Agriculture. However, the proposal shall elaborate further on how the proposed project will be built on the existing CBIT activities and how it will coordinate with the Ministry of Agriculture. For instance, the proposal mentions in several instances the need for capacity building in the AFOLU sector (i.e., ?enhancing national capacity to obtain activity data for estimating sub-categories 3.B2, 3.B.6 in category 3.B Lands in the AFOLU sector?), but it does not clarify to what extent these capacity needs are being provided by the CBIT project and how the proposed project will complement them. Also, under the stakeholder section the coordination and collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture as the executing agency of the CBIT project shall be strengthened/further acknowledged.

### - Editorial errors

Please fix and clarify editorial problems as follows.

Typos and missing chapter:

- 1) ?CUBAENERGIA? and ?Cubaenergia? are mixed, so please unify the notation.
- 2) Chapter number in Enabling Activity Outputs (in P.19), 3.1.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3 ? 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3
- 3) In P.8, Outcome 1.1.4 is missing. Please add it

Abbreviations:

- 1) Regarding abbreviation words, to avoid confusion, please explain them when they appeared for the first time, i.e., FOLU, INGEI, TTE, MPGs, etc. and check through again. (TTE has an explanation in P.25, but it appears in P.8 for the first time, also MPGs has an explanation in P.6, but it appears in P.5 for the first time)
- 2) In Enabling Activity Outputs 2.1.3 (in P.9 and P.18), IPPU is ?Industrial Processes and Product Use? (not ?Industrial Processes and Use of Products?).
- 3) In P.26, the abbreviation ?the Support to National Implementation (support to NIM) modality? may cause confusion. Please clarify it. Since ?support to NIM? appears only twice, isn't it necessary to abbreviate it?

## Agency's Comments

GEF Agency response, 17 August 2023

### - MRV system

Comment is addressed in EA proposal, part B: Enabling Activity Summary

Currently, the country does not have a comprehensive MRV system that could fulfill the requirements of the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement, neither that covers all the necessary processes for the preparation of the BTRs and the NCs. With the collaboration of ICAT, the first MRV system in Cuba is being designed, to properly monitor and report the progress of the Cuban NDC. At the same time, the CBIT project is developing an MRV system specific for the AFOLU sector.

#### **-CBIT**

The comment is addressed in EA proposal in the part C: Eligibility criteria, subsection: Baseline projects, programs, and initiatives

The CBIT project will represent a major advance in AFOLU sector, by the time this proposal starts implementation:

? CBIT project, will create institutional capacities in the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), to ensure that MINAG can prepare the information and report to CITMA for the inclusion in national reports. MINAG will be able to report the chapter of the inventory, corresponding to the AFOLU sector, in addition to the monitoring and reporting of its mitigation and adaptation actions. This is a change in the institutional arrangements and methodologies used in the country for the preparation of national reports, since previously the preparation of the AFOLU sector reports had been mostly the responsibility of institutions outside MINAG.

? The experience created in MINAG with the implementation of the specific MRV system for AFOLU sector is expected to serve as a starting point and example for the rest of the sectors, to start developing their own capacities for monitoring and reporting.

? The capacities created by CBIT project will create an enabling environment in MINAG that will allow to concentrate the efforts of the national institutions and experts involved in the preparation of the national reports on the rest of the sectors, without neglecting their role in the quality control of the information of the AFOLU sector, which optimizes the management of human resources.

? The platform for the collection, management and dissemination of climate data developed by CBIT project in the AFOLU Sector, will serve as a reference for the possible creation of a broader national platform.

? CBIT will ensure an increase in accuracy, quality, and scope in the AFOLU data, which will contribute to a higher quality of the national inventory.

? The experts trained under CBIT could share experiences, support, and contribute to the capacity building of the rest of the sectors.

- **Editorial errors**

All editorial errors have been adjusted/corrected within the submitted documents.

- **Abbreviations**

All comments relating to Abbreviations have been addressed within the submitted documents

**Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information**

**Eligibility Criteria.**

**Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**Toshi 7/11/2023:**

**Yes.**

**Agency's Comments**

**Institutional framework.**

**Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**Toshi 8/17/2023:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Toshi 7/11/2023:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

**Executing Agency**

The Execution Agency for the proposed project is CUBAnergia, while in previous NC and BUR projects the executing agency was the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment. Also, the proposal states that *?The preparation process of the previous Third National Communications and First Biennial Update Reports to the Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC, has contributed to the institutional strengthening of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA), as competent lead institution for the application of the Convention as well as of other relevant institutions at national level?.* Under the section on institutional arrangement, please elaborate further on why CUBAnergia has been selected as executing agency and the role CITMA is expected to play in the proposed project.

Likewise, under the stakeholder table please indicate in the last column ?Means of engagement? that CUBAENERGIA is expected to execute the project, i.e., project coordination.

#### Agency's Comments

GEF Agency response, 17 August 2023

#### - **Executing Agency**

The comment is addressed under section B: Enabling activity summary, subsection: Stakeholders? involvement and in the part D: Institutional Framework.

CUBAENERGIA has been designated by the Cuban Government as the executing entity of the of the project, under direct supervision of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA). CUBAENERGIA led the process of preparing the First Biennial Update Report (BUR 2020) to the UNFCCC. At the same time, CUBAENERGIA is the lead of the ETF under the Paris agreement and the NDC, at the national levels.

CUBAENERGIA will be leading the development of BTR and NC, and will submit the reports to CIMTA for approval. It is responsible for the execution of the project and interacts with the specialists of the national entities involved in the project. It has the necessary personnel capacities for the coordination and administrative functions of the project.

CITMA exercises political functions of stewardship over the project and the general process of preparation of the reports, as well as submits them to the UNFCCC.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation.**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Yes.** The M&E budget for the project is \$20,200.

#### Agency's Comments

#### **Section 3. Information Tables**

#### **GEF resource availability.**

**Is the proposed GEF financing in Table F (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?**

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

**Toshi 7/11/2023:**

**Yes.**

**Agency Response**

**Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Yes.** This is in line with Information Note

GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency's Comments

**Rio Markers.**

**Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Yes.**

Agency's Comments

**Country endorsement.**

**Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**Yes.** The project has been endorsed by the country's GEF OFP and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts in the Portal.

Agency's Comments

**Response to Comments**

**Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)**

**Gef Secretariat comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Council comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**N/A.**



Agency's Comments

**STAP comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 7/11/2023:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Project Budget Table.**

**Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 8/23/2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Toshi 8/17/2023:

Thank you for addressing to previous comments. Regarding the description of *Financial transactions (Payments, disbursements, and other financial transactions)*. *Aprox. Annual Financial Transaction: 184 Unit Price (rounded): USD 33.505 Total Cost: \$24,660.*? which you added, it is still difficult to understand, so please clarify the following points.

- 1) It says "Annual Financial Transaction: 184", but what is the unit of 184? USD? Or is this some kind of code number?
- 2) Also please clarify the "505" written behind it in the same way.
- 3) Regarding "Unit Price (rounded): USD 33.", how is this unit price used to calculate Total Cost: \$24,660?

Sub-contract to executing partner	<p>services provided by UNDP, as per signed LoA between Government and UNDP-Cuba and as agreed with GEF.</p> <p>Financial transactions (Payments, disbursements, and other financial transactions).</p> <p>Aprox. Annual Financial Transaction: 184</p> <p>Unit Price (rounded): USD 33.505</p> <p>Total Cost: \$24,660.</p> <p>Direct project costs will be charged according to GEF rules on DPCs. Please see Annex 16. Direct project cost – GOE, Direct project cost – staff: Direct Project Costs (DPC) are the costs of administrative services (such as those related to human resources, procurement, finance, and other func</p>								24,660
-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Toshi 7/11/2023:

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- 1) The responsible entity for the budget line on execution support services shall be UNDP instead of CUBAENERGIA. Please amend this accordingly.
- 2) In Section B, there is a formatting issue because the text is off the margins, which will make the document unreadable when circulated, so please take care of and fix the overlaps between the first and second columns.
- 3) The budget seems a bit unbalanced with approximately 26% of the total resources assigned to the equipment category and only 17% assigned to consultants and consultancy companies. Please provide a justification for this or update the budget accordingly.
- 4) The budget shall detail the amounts assigned to the members of the Project Management Unit (i.e. Project Coordinator consultant, administrative consultant, etc.).
- 5) Please itemize the budget lines for activities / expenditures? the way it is presented (for one example, the line of Sub-contract to executing partner \$24,660) prevent the analysis of the reasonability for charging these activities / expenditures to the three identified sources: PMC, M&E and Components.

UNDP request for execution support services in the total amount of \$24,660 has been cleared by GEF management and documented evidence uploaded in the GEF Portal.

### Agency's Comments

#### GEF Agency response 22 August 2023

Thank you for the comment. It is addressed in the Project budget table

- 1) 184 means approximate number of transactions each year of implementation. Considering planned duration (4 yrs), the total number of transactions during the whole implementation will be  $184 \times 4 = 736$

- 2) 33.505 USD is a unit price for each transaction.
- 3) The total price is calculated as number of transactions in 4 years of implementation multiplied by the unit price

$$184 \times 4 \times 33.505 = 24,660 \text{ USD}$$

The text in the budget table has been adjusted for better understanding as follows:

UNDP-Cuba and as agreed with GEF.

Financial transactions (Payments, disbursements, and other financial transactions).

Approx. number of transactions each year: 184

Unit Price of each transaction: USD 33.505

Total Cost:  $184 \times 33.505 \times 4(\text{years}) = 24,660 \text{ USD}$ .

#### **GEF Agency response, 17 August 2023**

- 1) Responsible party has been corrected to UNDP in the budget table.
- 2) Formatting issues in the section B have been fixed.
- 3) Cuba has the technical capacities needed for the execution of the project, as well as technical experience preparing NCs. Cuba has built its capacity thanks to previous enabling activity projects financed by GEF and readiness projects financed by GCF. Nevertheless, as there are new requirements to be fulfilled during the reporting process, additional expertise will be required, from international and national consultants.

Likewise, these new requirements need new capacities in terms of equipment and technologies, such as ICT equipment and connection services. Cuba has limited access to technologies and equipment with national budget, due to the United State ongoing embargo. This has been a recurrent issue in international cooperation projects, for which it has been demonstrated that, for the successful implementation of the project, there is need to buy ICT equipment and furniture.

- 4) The Project Coordination Unit personnel cost will be fully covered by national co-financing
- 5) Budget lines have been adjusted as per the comment.

## **Environmental and Social Safeguards.**

**If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached?  
(only as applicable)**

### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 8/17/2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Toshi 7/11/2023:

Yes. ESS documents have been attached. The overall project risk is categorized as low risk.

However, proposal answered "Yes" to the screening question, "Would the project potentially involve or lead to exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?" Please clarify and explain the situation the reason why you answered "Yes".

### Agency's Comments

GEF Agency response, 17 August 2023

The answer was "Yes", because during the implementation of the project could exist a minimal probability that any of the identified stakeholder in the Stakeholder Plan be unintentionally excluded. It was also the reason why the risk was categorized as "Low". The project will work so that this does not happen, but risk zero does not exist.

### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 8/25/2023:

**Yes.** GEF Sec comments have been properly addressed.

Toshi 8/23/2023:

Please update the checklist (Expected Implementation Start date) and resubmit.

Toshi 8/17/2023:

Please address the question in the Project Budget Table section.

Toshi 7/11/2023:

Please address the comments above.

Also, this Enabling Activity needs to be circulated 4-weeks prior to CEO Approval, please revise the Expected Implementation Start Date (currently 7/31/2023) to a later date to account for the 4-week Council review period.

**REVIEW DATE(S)****Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement****Response to  
Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>7/11/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/17/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/23/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		