

# Capacity Building Program to comply with the Paris Agreement and implement its Transparency requirements at the national level Phase II

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

12269

**Countries**

Ethiopia

**Project Name**

Capacity Building Program to comply with the Paris Agreement and implement its Transparency requirements at the national level Phase II

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

1/6/2026

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Saba Kalam

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **CEO Approval Request**

### **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

1/13/2026

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

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 results?**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/25/26

Cleared

1/13/2026

1. Project objective does not meet with the guidance included in the tooltip, which includes being concise ? instead, it is a summary of the project. Please ask the Agency to amend.

Agency Response

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

The comment was addressed.

**3. Project Description Overview**

**a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**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 appropriately funded?**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/25/26

3.a Cleared, objective revised.

3.c Cleared.

1/13/2026

3.a: The objective is too long, please make it concise and not more than 4 sentences highlighting what the project intends to achieve.

3.b: Cleared: Very clearly written outcomes and outputs. The identified barriers are relevant and appropriate for Ethiopia and provide a strong justification for CBIT 2. The dissolution of CRGE units following the 2021 government reorganization has clearly weakened continuity in MRV and transparency functions. Ethiopia has made progress in establishing a platform, but its current scope is largely inventory and reporting focused and not fully aligned with ETF requirements such as tracking NDC implementation, adaptation information, and support needed and received. Ethiopia's high turnover across ministries means that one off trainings do not translate into sustained capacity.

3.c:

#### **Component 1**

The Outcome 1 is limited to submission of the legal and institutional proposal to MoPD. There is no activity that supports enactment, operationalization, or early implementation of the adopted framework.

Activity 1.1.2 and 1.1.3: please see how gender consideration can be embedded in strengthening institutional framework.

#### **Component 2**

- Activity 2.1.2: Please include 2019 refinement of IPCC guidelines for energy intensive sectors in addition to livestock sector to move from Tier 1 to Tier 2. This will help Ethiopia to demonstrate that the methodology reflects the latest IPCC science across sectors.

- Also, the project should consider building capacity on national QA/QC protocols aligned with ETF requirements in addition to defined institutional roles for technical review, approval, and version control of inventories and BTR inputs.

#### **Component 3:**

As mentioned in the proposal, high staff turnover has already been identified as a systemic risk in Ethiopia, and training alone will not resolve it. Has there been any thought around retained the trained resources?

## Agency Response

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

3.a. The comment was addressed.

3.c. The Output is limited to making a proposal available to decision-makers for consideration. The project cannot commit to adopting a legal or policy proposal, as that is the prerogative of national authorities.

However, MoPD is both the project's implementing partner and the primary decision-maker for adopting the legal and institutional proposal to be prepared with the project's support. In that context, the project will be well positioned to support and influence the adoption process.

Activities 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. The comment was addressed.

Component 2. The different gaps and opportunities to improve the GHG inventory were assessed and prioritised by MoPD and project stakeholders. The consensus is to focus on the livestock and cement categories, both of which are key GHG emission sources. Other sectors, such as energy-intensive sectors, could be addressed in future activities to continue improving the country's GHG inventory, but stakeholders have not prioritised those activities for this project.

The proposal already includes activities to build capacities related to GHG inventories, including quality assurance, quality control and the assessment of uncertainty. These are included under Output 3.2. on 'stakeholders' capacities strengthened to improve performance of transparency-related functions'.

Component 3. The project cannot prevent staff turnover, however, the proposed capacity building programme (activity 3.2.3) will remain available under an agreement with a partner institution (activity 3.2.4). These training resources will be used during the onboarding of new staff with transparency-related functions and periodically to reinforce existing staff's learning and capabilities.

This strategy responds to the findings of the terminal evaluation of the CBIT 1 project and is discussed in the section on sustainability of the CEO endorsement request (p. 18)

## 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

02/26/2026

Cleared

1/13/2026

4 a) (O&P Team) Please provide further details on stakeholder consultations in project development and further elaborate on civil society and local actors roles and interests related to project components and outputs.

4 a) Please include Indigenous Peoples as a part of stakeholders in the stakeholder engagement plan and identify their needs, roles and responsibility.

4 b) The project has adequately included private sector actors, and civil society to effectively access and use climate related information.

4.c) Not Applicable

## Agency Response

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

4 a) A section describing stakeholder engagement during project design was included at the end of section A. The role and interests of civil society and private sector partners are further discussed in section IV of the ProDoc under "Stakeholder engagement?"

4.a) Indigenous Peoples were included in the stakeholder's engagement plan.

### **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 thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**

**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 are 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 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 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

02/26/2026

5.1 b Cleared

5.1 g Cleared

5.1 h Cleared

1/13/2026

5.1 a) Cleared. Theory of Change is concise and clear.

5.1 b) Since the request is for CBIT-2, its important to record the gaps identified during stakeholder consultations, FSV/ICA/TER process of previous national communications and the Terminal Evaluation. It is suggested to describe this in a table for better clarity, an example given below. The table can also be modified as per need.

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
	Gaps related to capacity identified in previous FSV/ICA/TER/ information sharing/exchange of views process of last 2-3 reports	Gaps identified during stakeholder consultation (Group or individual including requests from the Government on capacity required to comply with ETF)	Gaps addressed by CBIT 1 or other agency like ICAT/PATPA/etc.	Gaps identified in Terminal Evaluation of CBIT-1 related to building further capacity in specific areas (if any)	Gaps to be addressed by CBIT 2	Map relevant output of CBIT -2 proposal addressing the gaps (mentioned in column 5)
Institutional						
Coordination						
MRV/GHG						
Accounting						
MPGs/CRTs/CTFs						
NDCs						
FTC, Adaptation						
Other						

5.1 c) Cleared

5.1 d) Cleared

5.1 e) Cleared

5.1 f) Cleared

5.1 g) The project aims to strengthen systems and capacities, but it does not clearly articulate how ongoing operation, system upgrades, and staffing will be financed beyond the project period, particularly under increasing ETF and BTR demands.

5.1 h) Engagement of the private sector and civil society organizations is mentioned, mainly in the context of consultations and data provision. Their roles tend to be advisory or ad hoc rather than embedded within core transparency and MRV functions, and there is limited detail on how their engagement will be sustained over time.

5.1 j) Cleared

5.1 k) Cleared

5.1 l) Cleared

## Agency Response

UNDP Response: 25 February 2026

5.1.b.) A table linking the remaining gaps in Ethiopia's transparency framework to the CBIT 2 project activities was included in section A of the CEO endorsement request.

5.1 g) Ethiopia is a fragile, least-developed country. As such, it is unlikely to commit to staffing and financing climate transparency functions in full in the near future. The proposed legal, policy, and institutional frameworks for enhanced transparency, to be prepared under Output 1.1, are expected to clarify transparency roles and responsibilities in Ethiopia; however, it is unlikely that all of these roles and responsibilities will be funded from the government budget. Some functions, however, are expected to be assigned to MoPD and financed from the entity's budget.

5.1.h.) Given the current state of development of the transparency system in Ethiopia, the CBIT 2 Project's priority is to strengthen the institutional framework for climate transparency across key government institutions, including subnational governments.

As discussed in the stakeholder engagement section, the CBIT 2 Project will seek partnerships with the private sector to address specific transparency needs.

It is unlikely that civil society will be embedded in Ethiopia's core transparency functions within the timeframe of the CBIT 2 Project.

### **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

02/26/2026

Cleared

1/13/2026

5.2 a) Cleared

5.2 b) The project has requested dual execution and implementation role, cleared by the Manager.

5.2 c) Please include coordination and cooperation with non transparency related GEF and Non-GEF projects especially for knowledge management and learning.

### Agency Response

UNDP Response: 25 February 2026

5.2 c) Table 8 in section B of the CEO endorsement request was revised to include non-transparency related initiatives

#### **5.3 Core indicators**

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core 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

1/13/2026

5.3 a) Cleared

5.3 b) 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 screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

02/26/2026

Cleared. Comment addressed

1/13/2026

5.4 (OP Team) The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently low) must be the same as the rating under the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk (currently medium), as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13. Please explain how overall risk was identified in the key risk table.

#### Agency Response

UNDP Response: 25 February 2026

5.4. The rating for environmental and social risk has been revised to moderate, and an explanation that the overall risk rating reflects the combined probability and impact of the different risks identified for the CBIT 2 Project was included at the end of the table.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Cleared. Yes the project is aligned with the GEF 8 strategies.

#### 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

1/13/2026

Cleared

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Gender Action Plan Uploaded.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

SESP 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

02/26/2026

Cleared. Comment addressed, the cofinancing for the PMC has been increased.

1/13/2026

1. (OP Team) If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.9%; for a co-financing of \$1,150,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$113,850 instead of \$50,000 (which is 4.3%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) ⓘ							
M&E	Technical Assistance	Outcome 5. Monitoring and evaluation assess project impact and guide adaptive management	5.1. M&E Plan is implemented	GET	91,100.00	1,000,000.00	
					Sub Total (\$)	1,092,000.00	1,150,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ							
				GET	108,000.00	50,000.00	
				Sub Total(\$)	108,000.00	50,000.00	
				Total Project Cost(\$)	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	

2.

### Agency Response

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

The allocation of co-financing across components has been revised. Co financing for PMC is increased.

#### **Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Cleared. The project to be funded through CBIT Setaside funds

### 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

1/13/2026

Cleared. The project to be funded through CBIT Setaside funds

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?**

**b) 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

1/13/2026

Cleared. No PPG requested.

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Cleared.

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

1/13/2026

Cofinancing of \$1.2 m pledged.

Agency Response

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) 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

1/13/2026

Cleared. The project has been endorsed by Mensur Dessie Nur, OFP since April 2023

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

1/13/2026

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/26/2026

Title changed in the CEO endorsement document. The title of the LoE remains the same.

1/13/2026

The project title listed in the GEF Portal does not match the one on the LOE. Please ask the agency to either update the title in the GEF Portal or obtain a new LOE signed by the current OFP.

**Subject: Endorsement for “Capacity-building Program to Comply with the Paris Agreement and Implement its Transparency Requirements at the National Level Phase II”**

In my capacity as GEF Focal Point for Ethiopia, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in

Project Information			
<b>Project Title:</b>	Establishing the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement in Ethiopia (CBIT 2)		
<b>Region:</b>	Africa	<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	12269
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Ethiopia	<b>Type of Project:</b>	MSP

Agency Response

UNDP Response: 19 March 2026

The project title in the LOE and the GEF portal is consistent.

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

LOE/project title. The project title was revised throughout the submission to match the title in the LOE.

**8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.7 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 the budget (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

2/26/2026

Cleared

1/13/2026

8.7 The results framework may change as per the comments provide under Point no. 3: Project Description Overview. The font size in the table is not consistent. Please make it consistent across the table.

Agency Response

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

8.7. See response to comment on Component 2. Font size corrected.

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Project area map included

Agency Response

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026

Cleared. SESP document uploaded.

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.10 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

3/22/2026

4. Cleared. M&E is now 4.8%

5. Cleared

2/26/2026

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared

3. Cleared

4. Thank you for revising down the M&E budget. Please note that this continues to be a little above (6.3%) the recommended threshold (5%), which is calculated against the GEF grant subtotal before PMC, and we could not find the justification for the higher allocation

5.

1. Thank you for the clarification on the "Project Manager?". The explanation points out that while PMC costs are higher (is not clear in the response) and other areas have seen reductions, the total budget for the "Project Manager?" has not changed. Please revise the budget table to accurately reflect the technical and managerial budget weight as specified in the TOR - also, please present the Project Manager costs in one budget line.

Contractual services- Individual	Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 1.1: 10%	16,800				16,800			16,800	UNDP
	Project manager 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 2.1: 10%		16,800			16,800			16,800	UNDP
	Project manager 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 3.1: USD 25,200 15% and Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 3.2: 15% USD25,200			50,400		50,400			50,400	UNDP
	Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 4.1.1: 5% USD8,400									
	Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 4.1.2: 5% USD8,400									
	Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 4.1.3: 5% USD8,400				25,200	25,200			25,200	UNDP
	Project manager 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for Output 4.2.1: 15%					-	25,200		25,200	UNDP
Project manager 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time allocation for PMU: 20%							33,600	33,600	UNDP	

We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

6. Cleared

7. Cleared

1/13/2026

1. Please clarify what is the advertising activity in the "advertising and communication budget".

Other Operating Costs	Advertising and communication cost USD 525/year.								2,100	2,100	UNDP
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------	-------	------

2. The title "Consultation and validation workshops for the development of national emission factor for enteric fermentation of cattle" may change as per the comments given on the outputs.

3. It is understood that the project will be jointly implemented by MoPD and UNDP. It is not clear where is the need to buy furniture, isn't MoPD providing space and basic furniture for the PMU to operate?

4. (OP Team) The average budget amount of the GEF funded part for the M&E component for projects up to USD 5 million is around 5% but for this project it is 8.3%. Please request the agency to revise down.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance	Outcome 5. Monitoring and evaluation assess project impact and guide adaptive management	5.1. M&E Plan is implemented	GET	91,100.00	1,000,000.00
<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>					<b>1,092,000.00</b>	<b>1,150,000.00</b>

  

Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GET	108,000.00	50,000.00
<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>		<b>108,000.00</b>	<b>50,000.00</b>
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>		<b>1,200,000.00</b>	<b>1,200,000.00</b>

**Please provide justification**  
The US\$1,000,000 in kind of co financing is not reflected in this table. Total co financing is US\$1,200,000.

5. A 'Project Manager' is being charged across components and PMC. Per the provided TORs it seems that the technical activities represent 55% of the role while managerial/coordination activities the other 45%, while only 20% of funds are being allocated to the project management functions. Please request the agency to reflect this in the budget table.

Contractual Services – Individual	Project manager, 48 months @ \$3,500/month. Time									UNDP
		16,800	16,800	50,400	25,200	25,200	33,600	168,000		

6.

1. Travel expenses for the PMU are being charged to component 1. Please request the agency to amend (should be charged to PMC).

Travel	Domestic travel by PMU staff and legal expert to participate in workshops. Two persons participating in two workshops outside the capital: four trips. Cost per trip \$1,600 (ticket \$500, DSA \$200 x 3 days, terminal expenses \$500)	6,400						6,400		MoPD
--------	--	-------	--	--	--	--	--	-------	--	------

7. 'Advertising and communication costs' should not be charged to PMC. Please request the agency to allocate/split this item to corresponding components.

Other Operating Costs	Advertising and communication cost USD 525/year.							2,100	2,100	UNDP
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------	-------	------

8. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

#### Agency Response

UNDP Response: 19 March 2026

4. M&E is down to US\$51,000. MTR was removed and IP/CO agreed to use cofinancing to conduct the MTR.
5. The budget table accurately reflect the technical and managerial budget weight as specified in the TOR funds are being allocated to the project management functions. Project manager is in one line now.

UNDP Response: 24 February 2026

1. The budget item refers to recruitment and procurement costs. They have been charged to UNDP's co-financing.
2. See response to comment on Component 2.
3. The cost of providing furniture to members of the PMU has been charged to UNDP's cofinancing.
4. The amount allocated to M&E and charged to the GEF grant has been revised down to US\$69,000 (5.75% of the total GEF grant).
5. The amount allocated to the Project Manager under the PMC was and the amount allocated to the project components reduced accordingly. PMC from GEF grant is allocated in the PMC section. A fraction of the Project Manager cost is also covered from UNDP's co-financing, The cost of the Project Manager allocated to PMC and funded from the GEF grant and the UNDP co-cofinancing is reflected in the budget table.

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### 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**

**1SMSP CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/16/2026</b>	<b>2/24/2026</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/9/2026</b>	<b>3/19/2026</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/22/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		