



Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II B: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10088

Countries

Global

Project Name

Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II B: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

8/10/2021

Review completed by PM

12/14/2021

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, the project remains aligned. However, please make the following changes:

1. For the project objective please revise language to replace "Paris Agreements" with "Paris Agreement". Please make this change in the Alternative scenario section as well.
2. The Institutional Arrangements section states " The UNDP portion will be executed by the Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH), using DIM modality." Please ensure that this information is accurately reflected under Part 1 - Other Executing Partner.
3. The Executing Partner Type has not been filled in. Please revise.

12/1/2021: Table B and the Project Result Framework states "Paris Agreements". Please revise to Paris Agreement.

12/2/2021: Cleared.

12/9/2021: Under Agency UNEP is currently repeated. Please delete so that it only shows up as "UNEP".

12/10/2021: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

1. Revision made.

2. This comment is not applicable to the new institutional arrangements where UNDP has transferred the full implementation role to UNEP. The portal has been revised accordingly.

3. The Executing Partner Type in the portal has been filled in.

[UNEP 12/02/2021: Our apologies for the oversight. Table B and Annex A in the portal have been updated.](#)

UNEP12/10/2021

The Repeated "UNEP" removed / deleted.

Project description summary

2. 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

8/24/2021: As mentioned above, please make the change for the Project Objective from Paris Agreements to Paris Agreement.

12/1/2021: As mentioned above, the Project Objective in Table B refers to Paris Agreements. Please revise.

12/2/2021: Cleared.

12/10/2021: Table B mentions UNDP in Component 3. Please revise.

12/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

Changed on page 1 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

[UNEP 12/02/2021: The portal has been updated as well.](#)

UNEP 12/13/2021: Table B in the portal has been amended,

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. 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

8/24/2021: In the co-financing letter from UNDP, please mention the duration over which the co-financing will be provided.

12/1/2021: Cleared.

12/9/2021: Since no co-financing is being received from UNDP, please remove the UNDP co-financing letter from the portal. Additionally, under Table C change Source from "Civil Society Organization" to "other".

12/10/2021: We note that the co-financing letter is now uploaded and Source has been revised. The UNDP co-financing letter has been deleted. However, we note that there is an additional co-financing letter from UNEP in the Prodoc (page 91). Please clarify.

12/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

The co-financing letter from UNDP has been removed from the package. Due to the withdrawal of UNDP from the implementation functions, it is not in a position to commit to this level of co-finance anymore. The co-finance amounts in all sections have been updated accordingly.

UNEP 12/10/2021: We are not able to remove the UNDP co-finance letter from our end, but we have uploaded again the UNEP DTU Partnership cofinance letter so the previous set of cofinance letters could be removed by the GEF Secretariat ITS support.

The source of co-finance in Table C has been amended to Other in the portal.

UNEP 12/13/2021: UNEP co-financing letter has been removed from the Annexes of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, the financing presented in Table D is adequate and demonstrates a cost-effective approach. Minor changes has been made compared to the PIF and an explanation has been provided. Overall amounts remain the same.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: Yes, the core indicator targets have increased and an explanation has been provided as to how they were calculated.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Please address the following:

1. The portal document states "In addition to these reporting commitments, countries are to submit a revised Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) by 2021, followed by a subsequent revised NDC in 2025." Please clarify and revise so that it is clear that countries may submit updated or new NDCs by 2021, and every five years thereafter (2025, 2030 and so on).
2. The portal document states " One important aspect of Article 13 reporting that resulted from COP24 was the agreement that Parties are to submit a *Biennial Transparency Report (BTR)* by December 31, 2024, which should include..." and then lists various aspects of the BTR. Please provide a few sentences that explains the flexibility provided for developing countries, SIDS and LDCs in brief.
3. The portal document states "Experience from previous and ongoing GEF-funded initiatives, including the Global Support Programme, the CBIT Global Coordination Platform, and country-level climate change enabling activities, has been collected from ongoing feedback and from project evaluations." Please reference the report that was produced from the CBIT Global Global coordination Platform on gaps and needs from the implementation of the ETF.

12/1/2021: Since COP26 has completed, please add relevant context/outcomes from this COP. The current paragraphs in this section are now outdated. (for example, the para beginning "The next COP (COP26) was postponed...")

12/2/2021: The response for this has been provided in the next question. This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response UNEP 30/11/2021:

1. This wording has been incorporated into the CEO Endorsement Request.
 2. A brief explanation of the flexibility that is provided for developing countries, SIDS and LDCs has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request(Part II, section 1A.1) under the discussion on BTR requirements.
 3. The CBIT GCP report is now referenced in the CEO Endorsement request (Part II, section 1A.1, footnote 8).
- 2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes. However, please mention any additional baseline projects/initiative that may be underway that provides similar support, such as ICAT.

12/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

This information has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request under the section on baseline information (Part II, section 1A.2).

UNEP 12/02/2021: [The reference to COP26 has been revised and the relevant outcomes from this COP are discussed now \(Part II, section 1A.1\).](#)

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/24/2021: Please address the following comments:

1. Please ensure that the project objective in this section matches that in Table B, i.e. revise Paris Agreements to Paris Agreement as stated above.

Output 1.1

2. Please comment and elaborate on how on-call support may be provided for BTRs, specifically if any assistance would be provided for preparation for technical expert review and possibly FMCP under the Paris Agreement.

3. Comment on how the project will conduct outreach in terms of receiving on-call support upon request. What strategies will be undertaken to ensure that countries with varying needs, and across different regions is being reached?

4. Comment and elaborate on the help desk for BTRs for ad hoc country request. It is not clear what the role of this help desk is (clarify why only BTRs), how is this different from receiving on-call requests from countries and its relationship with other activities.

5. Clarify why the deliverables are *recommendations* for knowledge products and not delivery of knowledge products themselves.

Output 1.2

6. Clarify who the ?network coordinators? are and how they plan to coordinate and communicate, and engage countries within their region. Are these in-country experts, government officials, consultants or others? From the description under Activity 1.2.1 it seems that these network coordinators will be recruited. In the context, it is not clear how the existing networks will be leveraged. Please clarify.

Output 1.4

7. Elaborate on the specific need for technical support that has been identified for the MENA region, and how this Output will ensure its delivery. For example, is the MENA region lacking specifically on inventories, or tracking of mitigation? Or is the gap

mostly that information is not available in Arabic? For output 1.4.1 please comment further on what aspects of the BUR does the MENA region need assistance with, and how this Output will provide it.

Output 2.1

8. Elaborate how outreach will be conducted related to the website, to increase the number of users, and have the maximum impact for the users (ie time spent, relevant/tailored resources available, etc.). For example, will training be provided to users from countries to highlight the various features of the website? Will the website be showcased at events/webinars etc., or leverage strategic partnerships/webinars. You may want to consider adding and a communication and outreach strategy within Activity 2.1.1. Provide any lessons learned to date from the existing websites such as the CBIT GCP.

12/1/2021:

1. We note the addition of output to "facilitate advocacy towards raising ambition by organizing trainings or side events in global or regional events such as COP meetings or the regional climate weeks." (Output 1.3.4). CBIT priorities focus on knowledge and information exchange, peer exchange, and learning sessions, and not advocacy. We recommend revising this output to align with this.

2. Please revise content/outputs as needed to reflect the recent outcomes from COP26.

12/2/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response UNEP 30/11/2021:

1. Changed as noted above.

2. The inclusion of on-call support for BTRs as a distinct activity (Activity 1.1.6) was added at the request of GEF Sec after PIF approval in order to emphasize the fact that BTRs might require specific support. It is expected that BTR support will be provided using the one-stop shop that will be established in 1.1.2. As stated under Activity 1.1.1, assistance could be provided for technical expert review of BTRs and for supporting FMCP. Support to the BTR preparation has been revamped through adding a new deliverable relating to supporting countries in the preparation of funding proposals for BTRs (activity 1.1.6 deliverable 9).

3. The project will utilize the regional and sub-regional networks that are supported under Component 1.2 to reach countries with a broad variety of needs. The networks currently reach 131 countries, including LDCs and SIDS, and coordinators are in regular contact with all members which allows a closer tracking of needs and progress of each country. For instance, one key network coordinator deliverable will be a monthly report with all requests for support logged and eligible requests responded to.

4. The reference to the BTR help desk has been removed.

5. The deliverables are recommendations for knowledge products under Output 1.1 because the design and production of these knowledge products is supported under Output 2.2. (Paris Rulebook knowledge products including training modules updated, developed, and customized).

6. Under the GSP, the regional and sub-regional network coordinators have had the following backgrounds: consultants based in the region (7); UN Volunteers (4); a regional NGO (1); and one led directly by the UNEP Programme Management Officer (1). Government officials do not serve as network coordinators. Pages 13-14 of the CEO Endorsement Request provide information on the background of the network

coordinators and country coverage. This project seeks to maintain continuity in network structures when relevant but adapt some networks based on lessons learnt. For instance, an important point for successful networks is having a common language. The CEO Endorsement request contains a proposal for streamlining the networks from 13 to 9 to take into account the language element and to better support countries. Activity 1.2.1 is necessary because the coordinators' contracts ended with the operational closure of the GSP project.

7. The need for technical support for the MENA region is broad and includes inventories, mitigation analysis, and the completion of BURs. The project will provide technical expertise in these areas (GHGIs, mitigation analysis, and compilation) and other areas as needed.

8. Additional explanation regarding outreach related to the website has been added to the description of Output 2.1, and communications and outreach are now explicitly included under Activity 2.1.1. During the CBIT Global Coordination Platform project each country focal point received a welcome email including documents with explanations on how to use the website and during the CBIT technical workshops the project team showcased different tools and functionalities of the online platform. This kind of successful practices from previous phases will be adapted to be maintained during Phase IIB.

UNEP 12/02/2021:

1. All references to advocacy have been removed and activity 1.3.4 is now aligned with CBIT priorities.
2. Any knowledge product and trainings will take into account COP26 decisions, as well as further COPs guidance. Yearly workplans will be adapted to latest guidance and especially to countries needs. Reference to COP 26 have been added in the alternative scenario, and some activities revised. (Part II, section 1A.2 Alternative scenario, section 8 Knowledge management, and Annex K workplan have been revised accordingly, highlighted in yellow)

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes this is well elaborated.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes. However, the portal doc states that the 'CBIT programme is designed to improve the mandatory reporting of the signatories of the UNFCCC'. Please revise this sentence to align with the sentence below.

Paragraph 84 of the COP decision adopting the Paris Agreement decided to establish 'a Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency in order to build institutional and technical capacity, both pre- and post-2020' that 'will support developing country Parties, upon

request, in meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Agreement in a timely manner.?

12/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

Wording in the CEO Endorsement Request (Part II, section 1a.5) has been revised to reflect the text in the review comment.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, this is well elaborated.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, this is well elaborated.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: N/A. This is a global project.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

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

8/24/2021: We note that there is mention of stakeholder consultation during the design phase. However a detailed report of stakeholders that have been engaged during the design phase (list of stakeholders and participants, types of consultation, etc.) is missing. Please provide.

12/1/2021: Cleared.

12/9/2021: The project highlights that civil society will be engaged through Information exchange; training provision; consultation; work planning, participation in meetings and workshops. Please provide further information on which civil society organizations have been consulted during project preparation and provide an overview of which CSO?s will be engaged in project implementation. Additionally, in the table on Stakeholder Engagement Plan, please revise the language for "Other GEF Implementing Agencies" to be clear that UNEP is the only Implementing Agency, and the other international organizations (such and UNDP, FAO and others) are stakeholders in this project.

12/10/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

A consolidated brief report on stakeholder consultations has been submitted separately to the portal.

UNEP 12/10/2021: The main CSOs consulted during the validation process were Conservation International (who implements CBIT projects) and the Greenhouse Gas Management Institute (focused on capacity building on measuring, accounting for, auditing and managing GHG emissions). This has been specified in the Stakeholder section.

Additional CSO?s that the project plans to engage during project implementation have been listed in *Table 3 Key stakeholders*.

UNDP has been merged with other GEF Implementing agencies and the language has been revised to ?International Organisations and NGOs that act as GEF implementing agencies for CBIT projects?.

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

8/24/2021: Yes, this has been provided and well elaborated.

12/1/2021: We note the revised plan. This is cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: While a brief description of COVID risk has been provided this is not sufficient. Provide a strategy or action framework for COVID-19 which should include an analysis for risks and opportunities.

Please include climate risks in the table.

12/1/2021: This has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response UNEP 30/11/2021:

A COVID-19 Action Framework has been provided as Table 4A in the CEO Endorsement Request.

Climate risks are now included in Table 4 in the CEO Endorsement Request.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: We note the mention of other initiatives in the stakeholders section in Table 3. However, please elaborate further on specifically which initiatives will this CBIT project coordinate with and how it will coordinate. Provide details on how it will ensure that there is no duplication of work; and how this CBIT project will build on the work of other such initiatives. We note that some of this description is provided in pages 26-27 of the ProDoc. Please provide it in the portal document as well and elaborate on the specific aspects mentioned above.

12/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response UNEP 30/11/2021:

Part II, section 1a.2 in the CEO Endorsement Request provide additional information on ongoing and/or planned initiatives related to transparency. This Phase IIB project is unique in its ability to provide flexible on-call support to developing country Parties upon request, its global reach, and its broad coverage (currently 131 network countries). The project is also unique in its ability to support countries in transparency topics that may emerge during the project implementation period (see Project Approach description under Section II.1a.3)

The MRV Group of Friends has played an important role in avoiding duplication of effort, and work within that group will continue under the IIB project.

The CBIT IIA project, which will start before this IIB project, continues previous GEF support for meetings that will allow for regular coordination with donors and other transparency initiatives. This information has been added for clarification in Table 3 in the CEO Endorsement Request.

Project-supported meetings under both the GSP and the CBIT GCP have included participants from a broad array of stakeholders, including other transparency initiatives such as ICAT and participants from projects supported by FAO, GIZ, and the governments of Belgium, Singapore, and Brazil, among others.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, the project is global but will address national climate change priorities consistent with the Paris Agreement and countries' NDCs as it will build the capacity of countries' reporting and transparency framework.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: The description states that "all components involve capturing knowledge and disseminating it in such a way as to reach the largest global audience?". It also states that based on the terminal evaluation different countries at different stages are interested in learning from different groupings of countries. Please elaborate on how this will be done in this project. Provide plans for strategic communications for this project as part of the KM approach.

Please include a budget in Table 6 for the KM and provide a brief description on how the KM approach will contribute to the overall impact of the project.

12/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 30/11/2021:

Learning from different country groupings is covered in the knowledge management strategy under "Capture and share relevant knowledge," "Create networking opportunities" and "Motivate Contribution."

Information on plans for strategic communications for the project has been added to the section on the knowledge management strategy in the CEO Endorsement Request.

The KM measures provided in the KM strategy in Table 6 are designed to be low-cost/no-cost measures that fall within the scope of work of the Transparency Experts and the staff tasked with maintaining and updating content on the global platform and the Communication Expert. The strategy activities will also be supported by the regional / sub-regional network coordinators. All Terms of Reference are provided in Annex G of the CEO Endorsement Request.

A brief description of how the KM approach will contribute to the overall impact of the project is now provided in the section on knowledge management in the CEO Endorsement Request.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, the project has been assessed as having a low level of risk.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes, M&E plan has been provided along with a budget.

12/9/2021: Section 9 does not include the M&E budget table, although we understand from Table B that some funds have been allocated to M&E. While the budget was included in Annex I, please include this information in the CEO Endorsement portal document.

12/10/2021: This has now been included in the portal.

Agency Response

UNEP 12/10/2021: M&E budget table has been included in the portal.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Yes.

12/9/2021: The budget table in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement portal document is not legible. Please delete the empty table below the budget table and insert the budget table using a format that can be easily read, so one can assess whether the different budget lines are adequately charged to the three sources from which the project's expenditures can be paid (project's components, M&E, PMC). Per Guidelines, please ensure that the budget is in excel format that is appended to the documents tab must be the same as that pasted in Annex E and in ProDoc. Please also ensure that the totals in the Table match the totals per component / M&E and PMC in Table B in Portal. Please ensure that there is no co-financing amounts from UNDP included in these budget tables.

12/10/2021: This has been provided.

12/14/2021: See image below, Annex G of ProDoc. The Project administrator and Project Coordinator are charged to both component 1 and PMC. We found the TORs for the Project Coordinator which specified the split between technical and management tasks ? however, no TORs for Project Administrator were found ? hence, the Project Administrator cannot be charged to GEF portion without TORs. Please address.

Reporting Structure: The PC will report to the Head of Transparency and Accountability at DT

Job tasks: The coordinator will implement both coordination-management tasks as well as technical tasks with an estimated distribution of labor of 93% technical support and 7% coordination-management

Technical tasks

- Provide strategic orientation and technical guidance and assistance to the networks work activities.
- Ensures that project activities are in the line with guidance provided by the CoP of the U contributes to the improvement of the UNFCCC reporting process and decisions relevant to the Paris Agreement.
- Ensures that all project-related materials—including workshop materials, publications, advice and other knowledge products—promote access to information and do not provide guidance that lead to social and/or environmental risks.
- Engages directly with developing countries representatives and provide them with sound backstopping on all different topics on MRV and Transparency, including not limited to, e greenhouse gas inventories, development of emission mitigation scenarios, establishment of systems, support to NDC tracking, establishment of monitoring and evaluation frameworks for This will be the most important function to be provided by the Coordinator.
- Organize and lead when appropriate provision of technical in person and virtual workshops and
- Follows the process of international negotiations in the UNFCCC and respective decision reporting of non-Annex 1 Parties and particularly in relation to the Paris Rulebook.

In Budget, Annex H-1: it currently has a line item, Miscellaneous - Sundry expenses that cannot be charged to GEF as per Guidelines. Please revise and consider charging to co-financing. Please ensure changes are made to the budget in the portal document as well.

12/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 12/10/2021: Our apologies for the poor legibility. The budget table in the CEO endorsement document and in the portal have been resized and the empty table removed.

The excel document has been uploaded with the same table than in Annex E. The totals have been double checked.

UNEP 12/15/2021:

- The project does not have a Project Administrator, this was a left over from a previous version when UNDP was still in the project, we apologize for this oversight. The project will have a one part time person ? Project Assistant? who will provide technical and administrative assistance to project implementation with an estimated distribution of labour of 61% technical support and 39% administrative tasks. The split is indicated in the ToRs now, and the technical and administrative tasks have been separated out in the Terms of reference. There was an inconsistency on the title for the ?Project Assistant?

between the ToRs and the budget. The titles in the budget tables have also been amended.

- The Miscellaneous- Sundry expenses have been removed.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: Yes, this is sufficient.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: No additional comments at this stage.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: Yes.

12/9/2021: Please address comments from Norway. Additionally, Table 3 and 4 need to be adequately labeled in the portal CEO endorsement document.

12/10/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 12/10/2021: The table with responses to Norway/Denmark comments has been added in Annex B. All comments were addressed, and relevant sections: *Part II 1.A 2) baseline scenario* and *Table 3: Key Stakeholders in section Part II.2* were updated accordingly.

Tables in the portal have been properly labeled and the references in Annex B are clearer as well.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/24/2021: N/A, a global project.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/24/2021: Please address comments.

12/1/2021: Please address remaining comments.

12/2/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

12/9/2021: Please address comments in yellow.

12/10/2021: Please address comments in yellow.

12/14/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

12/15/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

12/14/2021: Please address remaining comments.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/9/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	12/10/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/14/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations