

Strengthening the Capacity of Senegal to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11961
Countries
Senegal
Project Name
Strengthening the Capacity of Senegal to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
6/26/2025
Review completed by PM
7/3/2025
Program Manager
Saba Kalam
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- Please add agency id in the table.
- Please change Project Sector (CCM only): ?Mixed & Others?

7/29/2025

Cleared

7

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

- ? UNEP's agency ID was added to the resubmission.
- ? Project Sector was changed to Mixed and Others

Note to reviewer: all edits in the CEO Endorsement Request document have been highlighted in yellow for ease of reference (both in the Portal fields and in the PDF version of the UNEP ProDoc).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes Cleared

7/29/2025

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

Yes, Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

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

3.a The objective is concise and clear.

3. b One of the problems listed in the summary section is 'Weak legal and operational systems to support transparent reporting'. Since there are no outputs that addresses this problem, kindly clarify how this will have an impact. Would it help to have an additional output that supports the legal, operational and coordination part?

3. c In the table, we recommend the 'capacity building outputs' of the component-2 to be more gender inclusive.

3. d Cleared.

3. e Cleared the PMC is 9.09%

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

3.b. Output 1.2 (Institutional arrangements for the National Transparency Platform are strengthened) will address this issue. Deliverable 1.2.3 provides for a formal proposal on the NTP to be agreed upon with contributing organizations, including detailed roles and responsibilities, as well as plans for training and content provision. Deliverable 1.2.5 will include a review the existing legal framework to identify shortcomings regarding the framework for producing the ETF reports such as the lead and collaborating institutions and develop proposals for addressing them. Procedural agreements to promote collaboration between stakeholders, while fostering gender-balanced participation will be prepared.

3.c. The description of the outputs under component 2 was amended to reflect their gender-responsiveness.

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

4. a: In the National Context, it is mentioned "The GHG inventory does not meet the Transparency, Accuracy, Completeness, Consistency and Comparability principles", was it highlighted as part of the BUR review (ICA/FSV) process? If yes, then please provide the reference. It will further strengthen the justification. It further says "Effective monitoring and evaluation of vulnerability and adaptation are also problematic". Is it problematic or challenging?

? Barrier 1 is not mentioned in the summary section, and the challenge (Weak legal and operational systems) mentioned in the summary is not mentioned in this section. Please make it consistent.

4. b: Cleared

4. c: Not Applicable.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

4.a. As at today, the BUR1 of Senegal has not yet gone through the International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) process. This has now been clarified in the National Context section of the CEO ED. Findings are based on an analysis of the BUR1 document available at the time of project development. The term "problematic" has been replaced by "challenging" in the CEO ED.

The Barrier 1 statement in Summary and section A3 was amended and made consistent as "Weak legal and operational systems to support systematic organization of climate data for transparent reporting".

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

5.1 a: yes, Theory of Change is concise and clear. Cleared

5.1 b:

? Kindly explain how the project will collaborate and complement with other GEF and Non-GEF projects especially ICAT-2, it will be helpful to explain (briefly) how.

? Briefly mention what was achieved by the CBIT-Forest and AFLOU global projects and how this project will build upon the outcomes of those projects.

5.1 c: We recommend highlighting the gaps the project will address especially what ICAT projects couldn't do and the reason for selecting GEF support rather than ICAT-3 support.

5.1 d: Yes, cleared

5.1 e: Yes, cleared

5.1 f: Yes, cleared

5.1 g: We recommend explaining how the project will develop capacity of the Government to seamlessly adopt future revisions/changes in transparency reporting.

5.1h: We recommend including a small paragraph on the role of civil society and private sector at each component level, if its relevant.

5.1 i: Sufficiently addressed, cleared.

5.1 j: The KM section need some re-work. The MPGs are new in the reporting process, it will be useful to elaborate how the knowledge on using templates/MPGs will disseminated to other departments/ministries. Also how, the learnings from this project will feed into the ICAT project.

5.1k: Cleared.

5.1l: Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

5.1.b. The text in section B1 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment: *?Previous GEF national reports were not guided by the Modalities, Procedures and Guidelines adopted during COP 22 held in 2016 but lessons learned served towards more transparent reporting. The ICAT project defined the baseline through an analysis of the existing monitoring and evaluation system at strategic and sectoral levels, particularly in the Energy Waste and AFOLU sectors, to propose an institutional framework capable of meeting the MRV requirements of Senegal's NDC within the framework of ETF of the Paris Agreement. Climate Promise primarily provides funding for climate actions while the NDC partnership help countries achieve their national climate commitments through financial and technical assistance. This project will collaborate with other ongoing initiatives and complement past ones by providing resources to address still existing gaps and challenges for meeting the transparency requirements?*

5.1.c. The text in section B1 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment: *?Existing gaps that the project will address are the weaknesses in the legal framework, procedures and agreements between institutions for smooth data collection, quality control and sharing, a critical lack of tools for collecting appropriate data for meeting the needs of the GHG inventory at the mandatory tier level, and for tracking information for reporting in conformity with Articles 4, 7 and 9, 10 and 11 of the Paris Agreement. Additionally, there exist no national platform to host transparent reporting which the project will also cater for, including capacity building of national institutions and experts. This project will build on the previous ICAT project situation analysis through the preparation of robust MRV systems, including the development and provision of appropriate tools, and capacity building thereon to enable Senegal to meet the ETF of the Paris Agreement. GEF support has been preferred to ICAT because of the scale of the funding needs and most importantly the synergies that can be made when addressing the gaps in a holistic manner rather than piecemeal on isolated bases. Additionally, Senegal is not meeting its reporting commitments due to the existence of the gaps identified and to be addressed in this CBIT project in a single shot that will also enable dealing with cross-cutting issues?*

5.1.g. The text in section B1 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment: *?Senegal has been undertaking the preparation of its climate reports by outsourcing the different elements from national and international consultants as appropriate. This approach explains the lack of capacity of Government to take over national reporting. It is moreover not sustainable taking in consideration the frequency and level of reporting coupled with the roles that Government will be called upon to play within the new reporting framework to stay in accordance with the MPGs of Decision 2018/CMA.1. The project targets capacity building of Government officers on the tools and templates earmarked for development to support implementation of the MPGs?.*

5.1.h. The text under the description of Components 1 and 2 in section B1 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment.

Under Component 1: *?[?] The project targets capacity building of Government officers on the tools and templates earmarked for development to support implementation of the MPGs?.*

Under Component 2 *?[?] Civil society and the private sector will be privileged partners when implementing the NDC adaptation and mitigation actions. Thus, it will be critical that they are also trained to be able to contribute to the reporting process through collection and provision of data as and when required?.*

5.1.j. The text under the Knowledge Management subsection in section B3 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment ?*MEET will be the implementing agency while the DCCTEFV will be the executing one. All the elements of the project revolve around the ETF reporting requirements, namely the MPGS contained in the Annex to Decision 18/CMA.1. The tools and templates developed will target collection, collation and preparation of data for feeding into the IPCC 2006 Guidelines, its Wetlands Supplement and the 2019 Refinements for computing GHG inventories, and tracking adaptation and mitigation actions, and support received and needed under articles 4, 7 and, 9,10 and 11 respectively. Knowledge generated through the project of the MPGs will be disseminated through the capacity building sessions scheduled to take place under component 2 project whence all Ministries including the departments and agencies under their purview will be participating. Under component 3, the same Ministries, departments and agencies will be trained for preparing the UNFCCC report, namely generation of Common Reporting Tables and Common Tabular Formats to meet the ETF. The Ministries responsible for finance and gender will also be leveraged in the knowledge dissemination process for their contribution on the financial support received and needed, and gender integration respectively. The CBIT project will add on what has been achieved in the ICAT project through the provision of appropriate tools and templates for use within the developed MRV frameworks?.*

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

5.2 a: Yes, cleared.

5.2 b: Dual execution not requested. Cleared

5.2 c: Following on the previous comment, it will be helpful to know a bit more in detail how the project will coordinate with the ICAT ongoing project, what kind of inputs are expected from the ICAT project in development of the Transparency Framework.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

5.2.c. The text in section B4 of the CEO ED was further amended to address this comment: ?*The CBIT project will complement previous transparency activities and ongoing initiatives in furthering Senegal's capabilities to meet the ETF requirements of the Paris Agreement. One key project among others is the one implemented under the ICAT framework. The latter is providing support for Senegal to set up a climate finance tracking framework which will help to partly cater for Article 9 of the Paris Agreement. The CBIT project will deliver and complement by developing the necessary tools and templates, including capacity building on these for Senegal to collect the required information on finance support received and needed under this ICAT framework?.*

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

Yes, Cleared.

7/29/2025

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

5.4 a: The "capacity risk" need to be articulated well. The risk could be "the intended capacity is not sufficiently developed at all levels". The mitigation measure identified for capacity risk is "change in the executing agency". Which executing agency is this, is it Ministry of the Environment and Ecological Transition, DCCTEFV?

5.4 b: The "Institutional and Policy" risk need to have a rating.

5.3 c: Yes, cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

5.4.a. Thank you for your comment. The new text reads:

"Assessment: the intended capacity of DCCTEFV of the MEET is not sufficiently developed at all levels to implement the project even though it has a lot of experience in implementing transparency projects, namely 3 NCs, 1 BUR, the ICAT and the ongoing NC4".

?Mitigation measures: UNEP will oversee and monitor the implementation post its assessment during the project development phase and should problems arise, UNEP in collaboration with the PSC will analyse the situation, identify the cause and correct it. Should the situation persist, a change in the executing agency can be resorted to?.

5.4.b. The rating for Institutional and Policy is ?Low?.

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 Not Applicable.

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

Yes, Cleared. Aligned with CCM Objective 2.

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, it is aligned with implementation of the Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Cleared

7/29/2025

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 Not Applicable.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, Policy section has been completed outlining gender engagement. Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Gender Action Plan not uploaded, please upload the plan document.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

A PDF copy of the Gender Action Plan has been uploaded in the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Stakeholder engagement plan not uploaded, please upload the plan document.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

A PDF copy of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been uploaded in the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal.

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

Yes, cleared.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Trust Fund- CCM

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable.

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable.

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared.

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

8.2 a: Yes, cleared

8.2 b: Yes in Annex D: Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, cleared

7/29/2025

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

Yes, co-financing letter provided by Ministry of the Environment and Ecological Transition, DCCTEFV, Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, checked against the database. The project has been endorsed by Mr. Baba Drame (OFP since 2019-11-12). Cleared.

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, Cleared.

7/29/2025

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

The LOE is missing the footnote subject to the designated executing entity to the capacity assessment by UNEP. Please obtain an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing to such condition, or a revised LOE with such added footnote.

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP response (29/07/2025):

The updated LOE has been uploaded in the GEF Portal.

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 Not Applicable.

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

Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

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

Yes, Cleared

7/29/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

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 Not Applicable

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Kindly address the comments in the review sheet, highlight the changes in the portal form in yellow, and resubmit.

7/29/2025

The resubmitted project has addressed all the comments. It is recommended for further processing.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please address the comments in the review sheet and resubmit

7/29/2025

The resubmitted project has addressed all the comments. It is recommended for further processing.

9.3 Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments

First Review

7/10/2025

7/29/2025

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)