



Enhancing climate change transparency in Mongolia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11377

Countries

Mongolia

Project Name

Enhancing climate change transparency in Mongolia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/17/2023

Review completed by PM

11/13/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

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

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: FAO has been included as an Executing Partner in the Information section. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023: Please include FAO under Executing Partners in the Information section.

Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this project? Yes

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

As requested by the OFP, FAO will provide execution services on the hiring of International Climate Transparency/GHG Inventory Experts (international consultants), and logistical arrangements of international travel associated with the above experts due to the limited capacity of the lead executing agency engaging experience engaging qualified international experts and arranging international engagement travel.

IRIMHE, MET reckons FAO to be in the best position to select international experts in a timely manner in support of the country to build the technical capacity needed in the ETF areas. FAO, as a specialized agency of the UN, not only has well-established mechanisms in place to attract and hire international consultants but can reach out to the expert networks to attract qualified international personnel, with MRV and M&E-related experience in all GHG inventory-related sectors, who could take up the assignment as soon as possible.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

Thank you for your feedback. Based on the review comments, revisions are made by adding FAO as an Executing Partner.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023: Yes, it is correctly filled out. Rio Marker 2 for CCM and 1 for CCA. 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

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. Gender dimensions are now expressly stated in the project description/component table. Cleared.
4. All references to the Ministry of Environment and Tourism are now using the MET acronym. Cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. The summary refers to the first CBIT project in Mongolia (GEF ID 9834) focusing on building capacities in the AFOLU sector. In order to explicitly differentiate the first and second CBIT projects of Mongolia, please make all references to the first CBIT using its project GEF ID (9834).
2. Please consider adding the global environmental benefits (GEBs) targets in the summary.
3. Gender dimensions are not expressly stated in the project description summary/project component table. Please amend.
4. [General comment] Please ensure you use the same acronym to describe the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. You seem to use MET and MoET to describe. To avoid confusion, please correct and use only one acronym.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

- (1) Project GEF ID (9834) is added for all references to the first CBIT project and highlighted in yellow.
- (2) In the summary the number of people expected to be benefitted is added and highlighted in yellow colour.
- (3) Gender dimensions are added in the project summary, description, and component table, and highlighted in yellow.

(4) The project document is revised using the MET acronym throughout the document.

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

EBF/WH 3/4/2024:??

1. Annex D has been updated to reflect the changes resulting from the CEO Approval Document Revision. Comment cleared.

EBF/WH 2/27/2024:

1. Thank you for amending Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.2.1 on the identification of the specific sectors to be covered within the NDC. However, the adjustment is not reflected in Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Workplan.

Please also ensure to reflect the change on Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Work Plan, for which Output 2.2.1 still cites "for all sectors included in the NDC?". Moreover, kindly ensure that Annex D of the Agency Project Document also reflects all the changes made to the Outcomes, outputs, and activities throughout the CEO Approval Stage.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

1. Thank you for providing an amended version of the document with a focus on prioritized categories within the Energy and Agriculture sectors. Nevertheless, please note that Output 2.1.3 still cites that it will focus on all sectors in the Project Description section on page 19, while Output 2.2.1 still cites the Deliverables table within the Knowledge Generation and Management section on page 25 still cites that it will cover all sectors. Kindly amend these two mentions to reflect the sectorial focus.

2. FAO's in-kind co-finance has been augmented to USD 308,000 (from USD 300,000) by increasing the Project Management Cost section. A revised Co-finance letter has been provided and it has been updated. Now, both the GEF Project Financing and the Co-Financing Contributions for PMC correspond to 9.09%. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

1. As a logical next step of the assessment report of the technical and institutional needs of Output 1.1.1 for the implementation of the ETF across all sectors at the national and local levels, the project team should prioritize the sectors in which it will focus for each of the outputs. Given the limited budget of a CBIT project, covering all sectors of the ETF of Mongolia at the national and local levels does not seem too realistic. Please amend the wording of outputs to indicate that they will address all sectors (1.1.2, 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2) or specify if they will be focused on prioritized sectors.
2. The GEF Project Financing and the Co-Financing Contributions for PMC correspond to 9.09% and 8.57% of the total GEF grant and total co-financing contributions, respectively. If possible, please adjust the co-financing contribution to the PMC so that it is proportional to the GEF project financing contribution.

Agency Response

RE 2/27:

Many thanks for the review comment. Accordingly, Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Work Plan is now updated and highlighted in blue.

RE 1/22:

(1) The project document is revised by adding the NDC prioritized sectors in the Project Description and Knowledge Generation and Management sections.

RE 11/16:

(1) The project document is revised by adding the NDC prioritized sectors and highlighted in yellow. Please see Outputs 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, and 2.2.2.

(2) The co-financing contribution for PMC is revised making it proportional to the GEF project financing contribution. The revised co-financing letter is uploaded. The revision is highlighted with yellow in the project description overview table, and ANNEX A: FINANCING TABLES

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

EBF/WH 2/27/2024:

8. References to the collaboration between the CBIT 2 Project for Mongolia and the Adaptation Communication in the future have been made for Outputs 2.2.2 and 2.2.4. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

1. Target II has been modified to reflect a focus on mitigation only. Comment cleared.
2. Figure 2 is now updated to reflect Mongolia's Institutional arrangements related to climate change reporting and associated stakeholders. Comment cleared.
3. References to the projects in question added. Comment Cleared.
4. Mentions to timelines to relevant projects are explicitly stated in Paragraph 8. Comment cleared.
5. The narrative was amended to reflect flexibility provisions for presenting BTRs for SIDS and LDC. Comment cleared.
6. Thanks for adding a brief description of the coordination of the CBIT 2 Mongolia project with the country's BTR1 combined with 5NC (BTR1/5NC) and BTR2. Comment cleared.
7. Table 7 indicates a detailed list of stakeholders that will be engaged during the implementation of the CBIT 2 Mongolia project. Comment cleared.
8. References to the coordination between the Adaptation Communication and CBIT 2 Mongolia projects have been made, particularly to Outputs 2.2.2 and 2.2.4. Kindly confirm if the Adaptation Communication will be implemented in parallel with the CBIT 2 Mongolia Project. If so, please amend accordingly in the Portal to include the Adaptation Communication under the section on cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects in the Portal and in relevant sections of the Agency Project Document. You can copy/paste the relevant text in the Agency Project Document into the portal form.
9. Comment cleared.
10. Descriptions of coordination and complementarity between CBIT 2 Mongolia and ongoing or recently finished projects have been added. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

1. Paragraph 5 states that the second target of the NDC is climate change mitigation and reduction of GHG emissions and increase resilience to climate change and build adaptive capacity (Target II); whereas Target III also refers to increase resilience to climate change and build adaptive capacity. Please amend Target II wording to mitigation so that it is differentiated from Target III on adaptation.
2. Figure 2 of the CEO Approval document indicates Sectoral distribution of GHG emissions of Mongolia in 2020 and not Mongolia's Institutional arrangements related to climate change reporting and associated stakeholders as expressed on paragraph 7. Please include the correct figure.
3. Paragraph 8 cites that "Some other recent national initiatives are Improving Adaptive Capacity and Risk Management of Rural Communities in Mongolia (2021-2028), Building Capacity to Advance the National Adaptation Plan Process in Mongolia (2019-2023), and Strengthening Institutional and Technical Capacity to Support NDC Implementation and Mainstreaming Climate Change into Subnational Development Planning in Mongolia (2021-2024)." If all these initiatives will coincide with the implementation of CBIT 2 Mongolia project, please provide a brief narrative in the CEO Approval Document for each of them to assess the complementarity with CBIT 2 Mongolia project. You can copy/paste the relevant text in the Agency Project Document into the portal form.
4. Moreover, for all projects mentioned on paragraph 8, including the SCALA and TCP initiatives, please indicate their implementation timeline. You can copy/paste the relevant text in the Agency Project Document into the portal form.
5. Paragraph 9 mentions that "As part of ETF from 2024, all countries (flexible for developing countries based on capacity) will follow a single, universal transparency process." Kindly reflect that the flexibility provisions for presenting the BTRs are only for SIDS and LDC Parties, as they can submit BTRs at their own discretion, but not to all developing countries. Please amend the narrative accordingly.
6. In terms of submissions of BTRs, please keep in mind that aside from project GEF ID 10019 for the preparation of the BUR2 and 4NC, Mongolia has also requested support from the GEF to prepare its BTR1 combined with 5NC (BTR1/5NC) and BTR2. The latter is not mentioned in the project. Please ensure there will be coordination between this CBIT project and the ongoing enabling activity projects, especially for the preparation of BTRs.
7. Even though the section refers to a lack of institutional arrangements and coordination to comply with the ETF across all sectors at the national and sub-national levels, the section does not indicate any specific stakeholders other than the MET in the CEO Approval Document. Please include a paragraph or table depicting the stakeholders of the project and their roles, including private sector stakeholders and local actors, that were included during the consultations of the project formulation and that will be key for project implementation. Please amend accordingly.
8. The Government of Mongolia hasn't submitted its Adaptation Communication to the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement. Would the CBIT project build capacities for

the country to produce such a Communication? If so, please provide a brief mention in the project proposal.

9. Please provide a list of the GHG Inventory categories that are currently using IPCC Tier 2 Methodologies.
10. Paragraphs 95 to 99 of the Agency Approval Document indicate related ongoing or recently finished climate change projects implemented in Mongolia. For each of them, please add a description of how the CBIT 2 Mongolia project will work on the tangible outcomes of each of them. Please amend.

Agency Response

RE 1/22:

8. Many thanks for the review comment. The reference is made to show the potential contribution of Outputs 2.2.2 and 2.2.4 for the preparation of Adaptation Communication in future.

RE 11/16:

1. Target II wording is now revised and highlighted in yellow. Please see Paragraph 5.
2. Figure 2 is now revised with the institutional arrangements diagram from the BUR 2 submitted in November 2023, and highlighted. Please see Figure 2.
3. A brief narrative is added for the suggested baseline initiatives and highlighted. Please see paragraph 8.
4. Implementation timeline is added for all the projects and highlighted. Please paragraph 8.
5. Flexibility provisions for BTRs applicable to SIDs and LDCs is added and highlighted in yellow. Please see paragraph 9.
6. The project document is revised by adding the suggested projects and coordination with those projects. Please see the yellow highlighted section of paragraph 47.
7. Roles of different stakeholders are added to the stakeholder engagement matrix. Please see Table 7 highlighted in yellow.
8. A brief narrative on the project contribution to Adaptation Communication in Mongolia is added in Paragraph 20 and highlighted in yellow colour.
9. A brief narrative on inventory categories that are currently used in IPCC Tier 2 Methodologies is added in paragraph 4 and highlighted in yellow colour.

10. Brief narratives on how the CBIT 2 project will work on the ongoing and completed country projects are added in paragraphs 94 to 99; and highlighted with yellow.

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

EBF/WH 4/2/2024:??

General comments:

3. Cleared

Specific comments:

2. Cleared

15. Cleared

15.a. Cleared

EBF/WH 3/4/2024:??

General comments:?

3. Thank you for updating Output 2.1.3 in its use of GEF's GEAP in the Project Description and Project Results Framework. Nevertheless, its inclusion is still not reflected on paragraph 2, and as expressed above in the Project Description Overview, please ensure that the changes are also reflected on Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Work Plan, where applicable.??

Specific comments:?

2. Thank you for clarifying that the TWG's establishment will be made through MET State Secretary or Minister's order without further cost and for stating that the CBIT-II PSC will oversee the selection of specific actors and priorities for each TWG establishment. However, considering all the ETF areas to be covered by them (GHG inventory, NDC tracking, adaptation, support needed, received, and provided), please confirm the number of differentiated TWG that are expected to be established and provide us with a list of potential stakeholders per sectorial focus to be included for each of them based on those cited in Table 7. In addition to overseeing the selection of specific actors and priorities by the CBIT-II PSC, kindly confirm how the CBIT project team will ensure that all the TWG's establishment legal documents are drafted in a way that allows them to deliver the expected results and if the CBIT project team will play a role (i.e., advisory) to ensure alignment with the project's objectives without further cost.??

4. Thank you for providing us with the link to the existing ETF platform to which the modules of Energy and Agriculture will be further developed through this CBIT project and for confirming that the Government of Mongolia has a budget allocation to provide sustainability of the operation of the platform after project's intervention. Comment cleared.??

15. Thanks for making the adjustments to reflect a focus on gender balance for outcome 1.1. and outputs 2.2.4 and 3.1.1. in the Project Description narrative and Annex C. However, their names are still not reflected in Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Workplan. Kindly amend accordingly to reflect the updated names for these outputs.??

15.a. Kindly please ensure that the updated names of all outcomes, outputs, and activities are reflected in the CEO Approval Document and the Portal, including Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Work Plan.??

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

General comments:

1. Descriptions of relevant stakeholders and MoUs to ensure the sustainability of project impacts have been included in the project document. Comment cleared.
2. Private sector engagement is now explicit in Table 7 and throughout the CEO Approval Document. Comment cleared.
3. Thanks for providing an explicit list of outputs utilizing GEF's Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP). Kindly confirm if Output 2.1.3 will also use GEF's GEAP. If so, please amend it accordingly to include it on the list.

Specific comments:

1. The involvement of relevant stakeholders, including non-state actors, is included in Table 7 and throughout the document. Comment cleared.
2. **Thanks for providing a clarification of the use of existing Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and for confirming the ETF areas of work that will be involved in the institutional arrangements. However, further clarifications are required. Please confirm what modality will be used as contractual arrangements for the development of potential new TWGs (i.e., Presidential Decree or other), and if all sectors within GHG inventory, NDC tracking, adaptation, support needed, received, and provided will be included in such arrangements, given limited funding. Consequently, please also confirm which specific actors within Table 7 are expected to take part on these arrangements. Please amend the output according to these observations.**
3. Coordination between Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 has been clarified. Comment cleared.
4. **For Output 1.2, thank you for confirming that the focus will be on NDC Prioritized sectors (i.e., Energy and Agriculture). However, as expressed before, please confirm if the cited information management systems will be incorporated in Mongolia's current ETF Portal for GHG metadata management in the AFOLU sector, and if so, please confirm what modules of the ETF Portal are already operative and how they will articulate with the new modules to be developed (as stated before, seeing a diagram of the modules of the ETF Portal would be helpful to understand better what is envisioned). In addition, thanks for clarifying that MoU and ToT modalities with academia and research institutes will provide sustainability for building capacities. Nevertheless, please confirm how this information management system will be financially supported for its proper operations and maintenance after project intervention. Kindly clarify and amend the output accordingly.**
5. Clarifications provided. Comment cleared.
6. Clarifications provided. Comment cleared.
7. Clarifications provided. Comment cleared.
8. Clarifications provided. Comment cleared.
9. Confirmation of the stand-alone nature of the CBIT 2 Mongolia in relation to CBIT AFOLU+ has been added. Comment cleared.
10. Agriculture and Energy sectors have been prioritized for Output 2.2.1. Comment cleared.
11. Adaptation with a focus on the agriculture sector has been the prioritized scope of work for Output 2.2.2. Comment cleared.

12. Complementarity between Outputs 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.1.1 has been clarified. During project implementation, please ensure to clearly identify how NDCs inform not only the Global Stocktake but also Mid and Long-Term strategies (Visions 2030 and 2050). Comment cleared.
13. Complementarity between activities 3.1.2.1 and 3.1.2.2 has been clarified. Comment cleared.
14. Coordination with CBIT Global Projects (CBIT Forest 2.0, GEF ID 11308 and CBIT AFOLU+ GEF ID 11316) has been clarified. Comment cleared.
- 15. Thank you for adding gender perspectives for these outcomes and outputs. Please note that for Output 2.2.4, gender perspectives are explicit in Annex C Project Results Framework but not in the text in the Project Description section. For Output 3.1.3, gender perspectives are explicit in the Project Description section but not in the Project Results Framework. Kindly amend accordingly so that both sections reflect gender perspectives for these outputs explicitly.**
- 15a. (Additional Comment): Please ensure that all outcomes / outputs / activities have the same name across the CEO Approval Project Document and the Portal.**
16. Timeframe and budget have been added for the Knowledge Management and Learning Strategy across all project components. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

General comments:

1. Please ensure that relevant stakeholders, particularly non-state actors such as women, private sector, CSO, and academia) and their roles are adequately described within each of the components. More specifically, wherever it's possible within the project description, please indicate if there will be a MoU with local academia to serve as continuous capacity-building providers in the training of trainers (ToT), even after project implementation among all the workshops that will be developed with this CBIT project.
2. Following on the previous comment, the private sector is not considered a direct beneficiary of the project, but they will be consulted as data providers. Please elaborate on how their participation will be ensured throughout project implementation, given the prioritized sectors.
3. Please specify which components/outcomes/outputs are envisioned to make use of GEF's Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) to ensure gender equality in project interventions.

Specific comments:

1. Component 1 mentions that the consultation activities will be assessed through a Government Action Plan (GAP) analysis, involving senior and mid-level government officials to implement the ETF across all sectors at the national and local levels. Considering the cross-cutting scope of work of the ETF, please advise if there will be no other stakeholders (i.e., academia, civil society, private sector, etc.) involved during the consultation processes to have a broader understanding of the challenges and opportunities posed by each of the actors and have a synergistic approach. In case other actors will be included at this stage, please include them and identify their roles (i.e., formulation, validation). Please amend accordingly.
2. For Output 1.1.3, please advise if the institutional arrangements for national ETF reporting will make use of the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) used for the creation of previous National Communications and Biennial Update Reports and if there will be new TWGs. Furthermore, please advise what modality will be used for the adoption of the institutional arrangements (i.e., presidential decree, etc.) and a list of potential institutions that will be involved, given the broad scope of work of the output (NDC tracking, adaptation, support needed, received, and provided). Please also clarify if all sectors within mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation will be included during this arrangement as it seems an ambitious target, given limited funding, or if a prioritization of sectors within each of ETF areas of work will take place. Please amend the output according to these observations.
3. For Output 1.1.4, please indicate if its activities will be conducted by the TWG on support needed, received, and provided listed on Output 1.1.3. Please amend their narrative to reflect additionality between the two outputs.
4. For Outcome 1.2, please clarify if the overall intention is to enhance the current ETF portal of the country building on the experience of the enhancement of metadata for GHG inventory for the AFOLU sector on the first CBIT project of Mongolia (GEF ID 9834). Please consider including a diagram of the modules of such a platform, indicate which ones already exist and which others will be prioritized to be developed through this CBIT project, as aiming to include all sectors at once seems too ambitious with limited funding. Please also make sure to elaborate on what stakeholders and line ministries will be involved in the workshops and consultations and what would be the role of the TWG in this outcome. Please indicate if the MoUs with relevant stakeholders will be drafted with funding coming from this output. After project intervention, please indicate how the platform is going to be sustained over time with national budget for the prioritized sectors. Please amend accordingly.
5. As expressed before, given that component 2 will be building capacities for BTR preparation, please indicate in the document when Mongolia is planning to submit its first BTR. Please indicate what stakeholders will take part on training workshops on MPGs of ETF reporting (activity 2.1.1.3) and other workshops under this component and if these workshops will consider the drafting of MoUs with local academia as a knowledge management sustainability strategy. Please amend accordingly.
6. Please advise on what emission factor categories within the livestock will be prioritized for their development under activity 2.1.3.3, confirm if they will be IPCC

Tier 2 emission factors, and the rationale for their selection (i.e., overall share of emissions in GHG inventory).

7. Please advise on what will be the expected result of conducting emission measurements in wetlands, peatlands, and pastureland activity 2.1.3.2. Would another project develop emission factors for these categories? Please clarify.
8. Activity 2.1.3.4 mentions workshops on managing emission factors and activity data for Energy, Livestock, and Pastureland. Since it is the first time that the Energy sector is considered within this component, please clarify which categories within this sector will be prioritized and the rationale for their selection.
9. Output 2.1.3 also mentions a connection with the Global CBIT AFOLU project (GEF ID 11316). Given that the global project will be working with 6 countries at a global level, please indicate if Mongolia will be selected among the 6 countries or if it will be working in parallel with the global project as a stand-alone national project. Please amend and justify accordingly.
10. Given the limited funding of the project, addressing all NDC sectors for GHG projections, scenarios, and update, monitor, and report mitigation priorities and action seems quite ambitious. Please indicate the shortlist of prioritized sectors / categories to be included in Output 2.2.1.
11. In line with the previous comment, Output 2.2.2 seems very broad with limited funding as it aims to cover NDC Adaptation actions, support needed and received, climate finance, developing an operational loss & damage reporting system. Please consider adjusting the scope of work under this output per thematic area and clearly delimitate its scope of work within the project budget. Please amend the structure and activities of this output and its budget by focusing on less but more specific activities.
12. Please further specify what is encompassed by activity 2.3.2.1 ?assessment policy documents to reflect experience with ETF and potential for ambitious climate action?. Please make sure that it is additional to activity 2.3.1.1. ?conducting the assessment of NDC priorities and engagement in the global stocktake?.
13. Please indicate the differences between: ?enhancing the ETF portal for uploading the sectorial data information for stakeholders (Activity 3.1.2.1) and enabling access for uploading raw data for calculating the GHG emission, tracking NDC actions (mitigation and adaptation), and climate finance for sectorial stakeholders (Activity 3.1.2.2)?. Please specify the type of stakeholders that will be involved in each of them.
14. Please indicate if activities 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.2 will make use of the Climate Transparency Platform created by the CBIT Global Support Programme, its Asia network, as well FAO CBIT Global Projects (CBIT Forest 2.0, GEF ID 11308 and CBIT AFOLU+ GEF ID 11316). Please specify how the project team is envisioning its interaction with these global projects.
15. Please ensure gender perspectives are reflected in Outcome 1.1 (in particular, on updating NDCs); and in Outputs 2.2.4 and 3.1.3.
16. The project proposal includes KM&L deliverables (especially within Component 2 and 3) to raise awareness, to promote learning and knowledge dissemination, to scale

up project achievements, lessons, and good practices, to enable institutional memory, and to support stakeholder engagement. The project will document and share good practices and lessons, especially through online/virtual training and information exchange. The project will also host in-person meetings and workshops, and maintain communication with stakeholders through group emails, a Facebook group and a WhatsApp group. While there is no mention of a communication strategy, it is proposed that project outcomes will be disseminated through FAO-implemented global CBIT information-sharing networks and stakeholder channels, the ETF portal/platform strengthened under this project, and through other relevant government-maintained websites. The project's results framework includes KM&L deliverables and total budget for each component is available. However, a clear budget and timeline have not been provided for the proposed KM and communications/dissemination activities. Please provide a brief description of the project's communication strategy and clarify the budget and implementation timeline for key KM&L and communications activities/deliverables mentioned across all components. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM&L section.

Agency Response

RE 3/4:

3. Thanks for the review comment. Based on the review comment Output 2.1.3 is now updated. In addition, Output 2.2.4. and 3.1.3 are also added to align the project description with the Project Description Overview and Project Results Framework. These changes are highlighted in pink in paragraph 2. Activities are also added in Annex D and highlighted in pink.

2. Based on further consultation with the government on the TWGs stakeholders and the role of the CBIT project team in forming TWGs, additional information is included in paragraph 4 and highlighted in pink.

15. The Paragraphs 2 and 4 have been updated accordingly.

15.a. Activities have been added to Annex D and highlighted in pink.

RE: 1/22:

3. Output 2.1.3 will also use GEF's Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) as per paragraph 2, and it is updated in Project Description overview table and project results framework.

2. Usually, Technical Working Groups (TWG) of projects are established by the MET state secretary or minister's order without further associated cost. CBIT-II PSC will oversee the selection of specific actors and priorities for each TWG establishment. This aspect is added and highlighted in paragraph 4.

4. The ETF portal (<https://eic.mn/>) of Mongolia is stable because the Environmental Information Data Center is stated by the Mongolian law on the environment with its budget allocation for the responsible division at the IRIMHE. ETF portal is operative for uploading and saving climate change-related reports and information sharing and shall be further improved with modules for NDC tracking and ETF reporting. The current view of the ETF portal is added. Please see paragraph 8.

15. Gender perspectives for output 2.2.4 are explicitly added in the Project Description (paragraph 5). Gender perspectives for output 3.1.3 are explicitly added in the Project Results Framework and highlighted.

RE 11/16:

General comments:

1. A brief narrative of the role of the stakeholders and possible signing of MoU with local academia are added. Name of potential academies also exists in the table.
2. A brief narrative on how the private sector will be involved is updated in Table 7 and highlighted in yellow.
3. The outputs are specified and highlighted in yellow.

Specific comments:

1. Involvement of other stakeholders are added in paragraph 17 and highlighted in yellow.
2. The Technical Working Groups (TWGs) of previous National Communications and Biennial Update Reports will be involved for national ETF reporting. Based on needs and capacities, ad hoc working group will be established through contractual arrangements. The revision is added and highlighted in yellow.
3. Involvement of TWGs on support needed, received, and provided is added, and the revision is highlighted in yellow.
4. The revisions are added and highlighted in yellow. It indicates that the focus will be on the NDC prioritized sectors.

5. Mongolia is planning to submit its first BTR at the end of 2024.

Stakeholders on training workshops on MPGs of ETF reporting will be selected based on relevance to NIR, NDC tracking, Adaptation as well as providing information on financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support. Associate revision is added.

6. Emission factors of interest are those which are necessary for Tier 2 level emission calculation from ruminant animals e.g. Digestible energy percentage. In 2020, methane was dominantly emitted from enteric fermentation which were for cattle (36.66%), sheep (24.76%), goats (22.84%) within the agriculture sector. Enteric fermentation contributes the highest to the GHG emissions with 56.90% followed by aggregate sources and non-CO2 emissions sources on land with 41.60% and manure management with 1.49%. The revision is highlighted with yellow.

7. There is a lack of GHG emissions and their emission factors (EFs) for peatlands and wetlands in Mongolia. Such measurements will address gaps in GHG emissions from different land-used areas at the national level in the expectation that these results contribute to the national GHG inventory and NDC. The revision is highlighted.

8. The national energy balance table shall be further improved by time series. Country-specific emission factors for the general energy sector determined by the Energy Regulatory Commission of Mongolia and GHG emissions have been calculated using the Tier 2 method. In contrast, the availability of activity data for the residential sector, e.g. the consumption of improved coal briquettes, the fuel consumption of civil aviation (domestic and international) and railways need to be improved. The revision is highlighted in yellow.

9. The revision stating the standalone nature of the proposed project is added.

10. The two priority sectors (Agriculture and Energy) are added for output 2.2.1 as well as project description table and highlighted.

11. The project will focus on agriculture for output 2.2.2, and accordingly, revision is added in paragraph 20 as well as the project description table and highlighted with yellow.

12. Activity 2.3.2.1 (assessment policy documents) is focused on other national policy documents including but not limited to Vision-2050, Green Development Policy, and the Sustainable Development Vision 2030. The exact scope of the policy will be determined during the implementation. While activity 2.3.1.1. is focused on NDC only. The revision is added and highlighted in yellow.

13. Activity 3.1.2.1 is for calculating GHG emissions and removals by involving stakeholders from energy, IPPU, and waste in addition to AFOLU. Activity 3.1.2.2 is for tracking NDC actions (mitigation and adaptation), and climate finance for sectorial stakeholders focusing on the agriculture and energy sectors. The revision is highlighted and highlighted in yellow.

14. About the knowledge tools and products (Activity 3.1.1.1 and Activity 3.1.1.2), the project will closely work with the Climate Transparency Platform created by the CBIT Global Support Programme, its Asia network, as well FAO CBIT Global Projects (CBIT Forest 2.0 with GEF ID 11308 and CBIT AFOLU+ with GEF ID 11316). After identification and user testing of knowledge tools and products, depending on the national applicability, the knowledge tools and products will be validated under Activity 3.1.1.3. The revision is added.

15. Gender perspectives are now added in Outcome 1.1 (in particular, on updating NDCs); and in Outputs 2.2.4 and 3.1.3. The revision is highlighted with yellow in the project description overview table, and in text, and the project result framework.

16. The suggested revision is added in E.1 Knowledge Management and Communication section.

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

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

1. Comment cleared.
2. See comment.
3. **This comment will be cleared when you address our comment to Annex G: GEF Budget template.**

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

1. As commented earlier, please ensure that the project will coordinate with the ongoing enabling activity projects supported by the GEF (i.e., projects with the GEF ID 10973 and 10019). Please explain in the CBIT project how the project will coordinate and complement these enabling activity projects.
2. There is a misalignment between this section of the CEO Approval form and the letter of endorsement. The CEO Approval form mentions two executing entities (i.e., IRIMHE and CCRCC), while the letter of endorsement only mentions CCRCC. Please ensure that this section is inline with the letter of endorsement or submit a new letter of endorsement that explicitly mentions the executing partners of the project.

- The CEO Approval document mentions that the OFP requested that FAO hire international consultant(s) in MRV / M&E and Transparency and procure their related international travel to support the project activities when needed. The costs of the internal execution are presented in the table below.

The detailed breakdown of the items administered by FAO is as follows:

Budget item	Details
1. International Climate Transparency Expert(s)	200 days x USD 500
2. International GHG Inventory Expert(s) - MRV	150 days x USD 500
3. International travel for the above international experts	Estimated 10 travel to Mongolia for 2 experts, USD 4,000 per trip, to provide capacity building in-country
4. Assurance activities (audit, spot checks)	1 Audit (USD 7,000) and 1 Spot Check (USD 3,575) per year
5. Mid-Term Review, Terminal Evaluation and Terminal Report	USD 21,500 MTR, USD 40,000 TE, and USD 6,550 Terminal Report
Grand Total	

We note that the internal execution of funding by the implementing agency adds up to 18% of the budget. International consultant(s) recruitment seems high, based on the number of days and daily rates. Please consider increasing co-finance for these positions or reducing the number of days and / or daily rates of the international consultants for budget lines 1 and 2 presented above for further consideration of exceptionality by the GEF Secretariat.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

- The coordination of the proposed CBIT project with other GEF Projects (GEF ID 10973 and 10019) is added.
- The LoE is now updated with two executing entities IRIMHE and CCRCC.
- Based on the review comments, budget revision is done by reducing the number of days and daily rate of the international consultants for budget lines 1 and 2. The revision is also reflected in the budgeted amount of different components.

5.3 Core indicators

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

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: Clarification is noted. During project implementation, if an ad hoc Working Group is established, please ensure to do so with gender considerations. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. If possible, please include the disaggregation of direct beneficiaries within each of the Technical Working Groups to be developed during project execution.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

The disaggregation of direct beneficiaries will follow the 60% women, 40% men ratio. However, the disaggregation based on Technical Working Groups is not possible to decide at this moment, because the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) of previous National communications and Biennial Update Reports will be involved in national ETF reporting. Based on needs and capacities, ad hoc working group will be established through contractual arrangements.

5.4 Risks

- a) **Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?**
- 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

EBF/WHC 2/27/2024:?

- 3. Overall Program Risk Classification in GEF Portal - Section D Policy Requirements ? Environmental and Social Safeguards Risk is set as low. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

- 1. Risks and their mitigation have been described. Comment cleared.
- 2. Limited funds, namely for the hiring of international consultants and international travel, will be administered by FAO. FAO will build capacities in IRIMHE in administration of international funding for future initiatives. Comment cleared.
- 3. Please also include the Overall Program Risk Classification in the GEF Portal, particularly in its section D. Policy Requirements ? Environmental and Social Safeguards Risk. Kindly amend accordingly.

EBF/WHC 11/16/29/2023. Please address the following comment:

1. For better clarity, for each of the identified risks, please first briefly describe the risk and then its mitigation measures, as some of the risks are only describing the mitigation measures directly.
2. The fiduciary risk: financial management and procurement is set as low. Nevertheless, it is considered the reason why the project team is delegating some execution responsibility to FAO. Could you please specify that these risks only relates to the hiring of international consultants and their associated international travels and that the rest of the activities will be procured by the Lead Executing Agency at the MET?
3. Please include the overall project risk classification in the CEO Approval Document in the GEF Portal.

Please provide overall Project/Program Risk Classification

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE

Agency Response

RE 1/22:

3. It was related to the Portal issue which has been resolved.

RE 11/16:

1. This has been updated in the Portal.
2. IRIMHE, as a national institute, has not managed donor-funded projects of this size to date, therefore, does not have experience in procuring international consultants etc. FAO aims to work with IRIMHE during the implementation to help build such capacity for future initiatives.
3. The overall risk classification was already included in the Portal. Please advise if there are other places we need to update.

Please provide overall Project/Program Risk Classification

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
<input type="text" value="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

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 EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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 EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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 N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. Please amend the stakeholder engagement plan based on the comments made above for the roles of the academia (clarifying if they will take part on the training of trainers -ToT- programs via MoUs) and how the private sector's participation will be ensured throughout project implementation.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

Based on the comment, roles of academia and the private sector are updated in the stakeholder engagement matrix. Please see table 7.

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

N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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 RequestEBF/WHC 11/16/2023. Cleared.
The Agency is requesting \$50,000 for PPG. In Annex D, they specify that \$31,418 have been spent to date and the remaining \$18,582 is committed.

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 RequestEBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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 EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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
EBF/WHC 2/27/2024: Yes. Cleared

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: We couldn't find the updated letter of endorsement. Please amend.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

As mentioned earlier, there is a misalignment between the CEO Approval form and the letter of endorsement. The CEO Approval form mentions two executing entities (i.e., IRIMHE and CCRCC), while the letter of endorsement only mentions CCRCC. Please ensure that this section is in line with the letter of endorsement or submit a new letter of endorsement that explicitly mentions the executing partners of the project.

Agency Response

RE 1/22:

The updated LoE has been uploaded accordingly in the LoE section of the Portal.

RE 11/16:

Based on the review comment the LoE is now updated including IRIMHE and CCRCC.

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 2/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: We couldn't find the updated letter of endorsement. Please amend.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. 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

EBF/WHC 2/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024: We couldn't find the updated letter of endorsement. Please amend.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. The letter of endorsement (LoE) template used for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate". Per the attached email back in March, when we were aiming to constitute the June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs "with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please provide a new LoE addressing this matter or provide an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE.

Agency Response

RE 11/16:

Based on the review comment the LoE is now updated including the footnote.

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 N/A

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

EBF/WHC 3/4/2024:?

2. Annex D updated. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 2/27/2024:

1. Core Indicator 11 updated in the Project Results Framework. Comment cleared.
2. Comment cleared for this section. As expressed before, please also ensure that the changes are reflected in Annex D of the Agency Project Document Budget and Work Plan.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

1. Thank you for adding Core Indicator 11 in the Project Results Framework Explicitly. There seems to be a typo in the Indicator Mid-term target (it currently states 175350 (60% women, 40% men). Kindly amend it to reflect the real Mid-term target.
2. Thanks for amending the Project Results Framework. Kindly verify that all outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project have the same names and details in the Project Description and in the Project Results Framework. Kindly amend the appropriate sections to reflect their latest versions.

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

1. Please include the core indicator 11 and its target explicitly in the results framework
2. Please amend based on the comments made in section 5.b. Project Description.

Agency Response

RE 1/22:

1. Many thanks for the review comment, and the typo is now corrected.
2. All outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project description are matched with the Project Results Framework and highlighted in the Project Description and Project Results Framework.

RE 11/16:

1. Core indicator 11 and its target is added explicitly in the results Framework.

2. Based on the comments mentioned in section 5.b. Project Description, Project Result Framework is now updated and highlighted using yellow.

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 EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.
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 EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.
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
EBF/WHC 3/4/2024:?

1. Budget on the form now includes Responsible Entity for each of the budget lines.
Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 2/27/2024:

1. The budget table in the documents section is different from the one uploaded in the portal form. The budget table in the portal form is missing the column with the entity responsible for each budget line. Please ensure that the budget table in the portal form includes this information.

2. Comment cleared.

3. Comment cleared.

4. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024:

- 1. We take note that the budget for international consultants hired by FAO (namely GHG Inventory, ETF and MRV Specialist, and Data Management and Information System specialist) has been reduced from USD 175,000 to USD 107,500. Please submit a request via email to the PMs (ebermudezfor@thegef.org; wholnesscarrasco@thegef.org) to consider the exceptional partial execution by FAO pursuant with section V (Exceptions for a GEF Agency providing execution services) of Annex 7 of the Guidelines on the GEF Projects and Programs Cycle Policy. The request must include a letter of support from the OFP using the official template. The specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by the GEF Agency, need to be clearly described in the letter of support. A justification as to why FAO should be in charge of executing this share of the budget instead of local execution partners should also be included in your email.**
- 2. Budget now includes separate columns for the budget administered by IRIMHE and CCRCC. Nevertheless, the updated LoE has not been updated in the GEF Portal. The comment will be cleared upon cross-verification between the budget and the LoE once the latter is properly updated to the GEF Portal.**
- 3. See comment. In addition, in the budget, the second position charged both to PMC and project component is called National M&E and KM Officer, whereas in Annex L, it's National Knowledge Management and M&E Specialist. To avoid confusion, please indicate the same name for the position throughout the Project Document and all its Annexes.**
- 4. Thanks for providing indicative terms of reference for the updated positions for national consultants. Kindly indicate if both the Institutional Arrangements Expert and the National Gender Expert will be responsible for all gender-related activities of the project, as indicated in Annex L. If so, please describe how the coordination would work between them to achieve Core Indicator 11 and amend the indicative Terms of Reference, as appropriate.**
- 5. Thanks for posting the budget in the GEF Portal directly. Kindly be advised that this section of the Portal still includes a reference to the previous section of the budget, where FAO was set to execute a larger share of the budget. Please update and amend accordingly.**

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023.

1. Internal execution of funding by the implementing agency adds up to 18% of the budget. International consultant(s) recruitment seems high, based on the number of days and daily rates. Please either increase co-financing or reduce the number of days and / or daily rates of the international consultants for budget lines 1 and 2 presented above for further consideration of exceptionality by the GEF Secretariat.

2. The column "National agencies" in the project budget is quite broad and unspecific. Please ensure that the entities in charge of executing the project budget are in line with (1) the Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project section of the CEO Approval form and (2) the letter of endorsement as commented in previous comments.
3. Per paragraph 4 of Annex 7 of the Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy, "if project staff is charged to both PMC and project components (i.e., not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat." Kindly provide terms of reference for the "National Project Coordinator" and the "National M&E and KM Officer", since both are charged to PMC and project components.
4. If possible, also provide Terms of Reference for the GHG Inventory, ETF, and MRV international Specialist, and Data Management and Information System international Specialist.
5. The budget table must be pasted in the Portal form. Otherwise, when web posted, external audiences will not have access to the budget. We will review the budget table per the resubmission.

Agency Response

RE 2/27:

The budget table now includes the responsible entity for each line item.

RE 1/22:

1. Revised OFP letter and associated document are uploaded in the Portal and sent via email accordingly.
2. The updated LoE has been uploaded in the Portal accordingly.
3. Based on the review comment, in Annex L, the position name is revised to National M&E and KM Officer and highlighted in green.
4. Thanks for the review comment. It was a typo and corrected for Institutional Arrangements Expert and highlighted in Annex L.
5. The budget section has been updated accordingly.

RE 11/16:

- (1) The budget is now revised by reducing the number of days and daily rates of the international consultant.
- (2) The budget is now revised by specifying the two executing agencies IRIMHE and CCRCC in line with the LoE.
- (3) Suggested ToR is added in the revised version and highlighted using yellow in ANNEX L.
- (4) Suggested ToR is added in the revised version and highlighted using yellow in ANNEX L.
- (5) Based on the review comment budget table is pasted in the Portal.

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 4/2/2024: The PMs recommend the project for further processing.

EBF/WHC 3/4/2024: Please address the outstanding comments related to the Project Description and **highlight them in pink** for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

EBF/WHC 2/27/2024: Please address the comments above and **highlight them in light blue** for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

EBF/WHC 1/22/2024. Please address the comments above and **highlight them in green** for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

EBF/WHC 11/16/2023. Please address the comments above and **highlight them in yellow** for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

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
First Review	11/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/4/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/2/2024	