

Development of the Fifth National Communication and the First Biennial Transparency Report of Georgia to the UNFCCC

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10743

Countries

Georgia

Project Name

Development of the Fifth National Communication and the First Biennial Transparency Report of Georgia to the UNFCCC

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/3/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 6, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 28, 2022: Yes. Please amend Rio Markers on Adaptation as this project will support the country report climate change impacts. Please also clarify the reporting format (separated or combined) of 5NC/BTR1 as they seem to be submitted at the same time (Part I says it's NC/BTR combined with the timing of submission is the end of 2024).

Agency Response

April 6, 2022:

The Rio Markers on Adaptation is corrected in Portal (it was mistakenly chosen as 0, it will be corrected to CCA-1).

We confirm that, the 5NC and BTR1 will be prepared and submitted by end of 2024 in a combined reporting format.

Co-financing

Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified [and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?]

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, in-kind contribution by the recipient government is expected.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**Are they within the resources available from:
The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request March 28, 2022: Yes.

Please also briefly explain findings of the ICA process and how the project would address.

Agency Response

April 6, 2022:

The technical analysis report of the 2BUR prepared as part of the ICA process specifies that there are no additional capacity building needs beyond those reported in Georgia's 2BUR for addressing the immediate causes of climate change consequences and that needs in the following areas remain relevant:

- (a) Enhancing the capacity of national experts and systems involved in GHG inventory preparation;
- (b) Data collection and the GHG statistical accounting system;
- (c) Training staff in selecting the best available technologies (industry sector);
- (d) Training of farmers to raise their awareness of nitrogen fertilizer norms and other ecologically pure alternatives for soils (agriculture sector);

- (e) Training of farmers to raise their awareness of biogas technology, as well as implementing pilot projects;
- (f) Training staff in selecting the most relevant technological solutions for CH₄ extraction and usage from solid waste landfills (waste sector);
- (g) Promoting land-use research using remote sensing databases [Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) sector];
- (h) Strengthening the capacity of the relevant responsible body in managing waste (waste sector);
- (i) Providing technical assistance to and strengthening the capacity of the National Statistics Office of Georgia (NSO) to implement international practices related to collecting, processing and using necessary data (waste sector).

Reporting under the existing MRV framework including NCs, BURs and ICA form part of the experience drawn upon and contributed to continuous building of capacity and expertise in advance of the ETF. The remaining capacity-building needs identified above in relation to the GHG Inventory process are currently being addressed by the ?Integrated Transparency Framework for Implementation of the Paris Agreement? project that has been implemented in Georgia with support from the Global Environment Facility through the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT). Among others, the CBIT project is focusing on the improvement of the national GHG Inventory system and related institutional capacities by the development of data management systems (including for the agriculture and waste sectors), and operationalizing higher-tier methods for relevant source categories of energy, product use and agriculture sectors. Results achieved in this national CBIT project will be integrated into the 5NC/1BTR, including agriculture and waste data management developments.

In addition, to complement the activities of the CBIT project, the 5NC/1BTR project will implement capacity-building trainings based on TTE recommendations including trainings for national experts on tools and methodologies for collecting, processing and analyzing data in the agriculture, waste and LULUCF sectors.

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 6, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 28, 2022: Yes. Please clarify if tier II will be applied to all sectors and if any higher tiers applied to certain sectors.

Agency Response **April 6, 2022:** We confirm that, the collection of activity data and preparation of the national GHG inventory for the sectors: energy, IPPU, AFOLU and

waste will be conducted in accordance with 2006 IPCC Guidelines, 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and 2003 Good Practice GHG-LULUCF Guidelines, using the latest version of the GHG Inventory Software for non-Annex I countries, with introduction of Tier II for all abovementioned sectors, to the extent possible for the years 2018-2022. The tier II is the higher method for most of the categories of emission sources/sinks comparing to the methods applied in latest national GHG inventory.

Stakeholders.

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 6, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 28, 2022: Yes. Please move the table within the stakeholder section.

Agency Response

April 6, 2022:

Although the stakeholder table was placed under the right section, Section B, its place within the section has been distorted after we save the page. We have now re-moved it again under the Stakeholder Dimension title within the Section B. If the problem of positioning of the table persists, we will contact the IT team.

Gender equality and women's empowerment.

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, only inception meeting is expected.

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The GEF amount is within the range.

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

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

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 6, 2022: The previous comments addressed.

March 28, 2022: The checklist is attached. Please address the few comments above.

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

12/23/2020

3/28/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2022	4/6/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations