

# Development of the Second Biennial Transparency Report and the combined Sixth National Communication and Third Biennial Transparency Report of Namibia under the UNFCCC (BTR2 + BTR3/6NC)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11853

**Countries**

Namibia

**Project Name**

Development of the Second Biennial Transparency Report and the combined Sixth National Communication and Third Biennial Transparency Report of Namibia under the UNFCCC (BTR2 + BTR3/6NC)

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

2/2/2025

**Review completed by PM**

2/10/2025

**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 Feb/26/2025:

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 Feb/26/2025:

**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 Mar/25/2025:

Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Mar/17/2025:

Please clarify if the country intends to submit its Adaptation Communication as a component or in conjunction with its BTR/NC. Output 1.3 and 2.3 seem to be related to this, but please clarify whether Adaptation Communication will be prepared and submitted to the UNFCCC.

Agency's Comments

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

**Yes.**

### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 25 March 2025:

Namibia intends to update the Adaptation Communication and submit it as a component as part of the BTR3/6NC and not as a stand-alone report. Relevant clarification is provided in the EA Request Form and the Agency Project Document.

**Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information**

**Eligibility Criteria.**

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

### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

**Yes.**

### Agency's Comments

**Institutional framework.**

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

**Yes.**

Agency's Comments

**Monitoring and Evaluation.**

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

**Yes.** The M&E budget for the project is \$10,000.

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 Feb/26/2025:

**Yes.**

**Agency Response**

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

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

**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 Feb/26/2025:

**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 Feb/26/2025:

**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

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Council comments**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**STAP comments**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat's Comments

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 Mar/25/2025:

Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Feb/26/2025:

a. The table in the CEO Endorsement Portal view (which is the document that is circulated and web-posted) is difficult to read. We kindly suggest to use the template provided in the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update) (<https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>), including only the Outcome columns and increase the font size to improve readability.

b. Additionally, pasting the budget table in the GEF Portal field it is causing a duplication in the PDF document autogenerated. Please remove the budget table pasted in the field and only upload the word document.

We will review the budget table again with the resubmission.

### **Agency's Comments**

14 March 2025 - UNDP response:

a. (1) Thank you for the GEF comment. Please note that the budget table, which was added in the portal is inserted with smaller fonts to ensure the budget was placed within the margins.

a. (2) The budget table provided in the Word is prepared at Outcome level, which is in line with the Results Framework of the EA Request Form, for the GEFSEC's review. Font size is adjusted.

b. The budget table which was pasted in the relevant section of the GEF Portal earlier is now removed. Only the Word format is uploaded.

**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 Feb/26/2025:

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

### **Agency's Comments**

**GEFSEC DECISION  
RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

Secretariat's CommentsPlease address the comments above and resubmit.

**REVIEW DATE(S)**

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/10/2025	3/14/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/26/2025	3/25/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/25/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		