



GEF 8 Umbrella Programme for development of Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) and combined Biennial Transparency Reports and National Communications (BTRs/NCs) to the UNFCCC for Cabo Verde, Montenegro and Somalia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12308

Countries

Global (Cabo Verde, Somalia, Montenegro)

Project Name

GEF 8 Umbrella Programme for development of Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) and combined Biennial Transparency Reports and National Communications (BTRs/NCs) to the UNFCCC for Cabo Verde, Montenegro and Somalia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/17/2026

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Remy Ruat

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

EA is aligned with the exception of the global level work which should be removed.

1. Please remove component 2 (Global Technical Assistance and Knowledge Exchange) which is not aligned and not eligible. CBIT and global transparency platform exist for this purpose - this envelope is for national level EA work only.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 20 April 2026

Component 2 has been fully removed, including all corresponding budget lines. This adjustment contributes to addressing several of the comments outlined below.

Cost Ranges.

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

No deviation at the level of the country envelope, but the project requests global set aside for knowledge sharing (component 2) which is not eligible as noted above

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

1. Activities under component 2 are not aligned. Please remove component 2.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 20 April 2026

Component 2 removed

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

Yes for component 1 - no for component 2

Agency's Comments

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

Yes, and please note that approval has been provided by GEFSEC for the exception request on dual execution in alignment with criteria d of the guidelines (umbrella EA)

Agency's Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (3/27/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments
Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

No - component 2 is not eligible.

Agency Response
Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (4/20/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/27/2026):

To be confirmed for the global component

Agency's Comments
Rio Markers.
Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (3/27/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments
Country endorsement.

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal

Secretariat's Comments
RR (3/27/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments
Response to Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Council comments

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
STAP comments

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
CSOs comments

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Project Budget Table.

Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

Secretariat's Comments
Cleared

RR (4/20/2026)

Noted

RR (3/27/2026)

0. As noted above, Component 2 is not eligible. Please remove altogether from corresponding budget lines. this may contribute to address some of the comments below.

1. The share of GEF resources budgeted for project personnel is over 58% of total requested funding. When preparing the CEO Endorsement document for resubmission, please review the personnel budget (individual consultants and individual contractors) to identify cost efficiencies and eliminate redundant positions if possible, or shift from higher cost international consultants to local ones, if feasible.

2. Please ensure that each discrete personnel position appears on its own, single budget line. For example, the Project Manager PMC budget should not be separate from the Project Manager technical component budget. Moreover, the PM and PA should not be combined in a single budget line. Please follow this approach for both the International and Local Consultants, which are also consolidated into single lines. Note that this approach complicates easy analysis of the budget on a value-for-money basis.

Contractual Services - Individ	Total cost for Project manager to provide technical assistance to Component 1 US\$315,900 (3 countries *US\$105,300); this is 1,880.357*56 months = per PM	315,900		315,900			315,900	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individ	Total cost for Global Transparency Advisor to provide strategic technical assistance : US\$185,000. These funds will be utilized to cover Global Transparency Advisory at a 20% time allocation over a 4-year period (as of 2027) to ensure continuous high-quality delivery, strategic coherence, and methodological rigor of the BTR and BTR/NC global umbrella project. The remaining salary portion of the Global Technical Advisor will be provided by UNDP's Climate Promise initiative.		185,000	185,000			185,000	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individ	Salaries for Project Manager and Project Assistant (3 countries *US\$100,000=US\$300,000) (part time PA: monthly cost 750 USD*56 months = 42,000USD; full time PM: 1,035.71*56 months = 58,000 USD)			-		300,000	300,000	UNDP

3. The comment above also applies to contracting firms. Please disaggregate the line captioned below by contract upon resubmission, of which there appear to be three.

Contractual services- Company	Total cost for companies US\$1,194,900 (3*US\$398,300). These funds shall be utilised for services (such as development of GHG inventories and sectoral reports) and procurement (various IT solutions, databases for data collection or improving MRV processes, various knowledge management or communication products etc.)	1,194,900		1,194,900			1,194,900	UNDP
--------------------------------------	--	-----------	--	-----------	--	--	-----------	------

Agency's Comments
UNDP Response - 20 April 2026

0. Component 2 removed.

1. The share of GEF resources allocated to personnel (individual consultants and individual contractors) has been reduced from over 58% to approximately 45% of the total requested funding. This reduction has been achieved through the following measures: o Removal of Component 2; o Reduction in the number of international experts per country from four (4) to three (3); and o Reduction in the number of working days per international consultant from eighty (80) to fifty (50).

2. In line with the guidance provided, each discrete personnel position is now presented under its own single budget line. This approach has been applied consistently to facilitate clearer value-for-money analysis and improved budget transparency. Specifically: o The Project Manager (PMC and technical functions) is consolidated into one budget line; o The Project Manager and Project Assistant are presented as separate budget lines; o International and local consultants are disaggregated by position rather than grouped into consolidated lines.

3. The same principle has also been applied to contracting firms. The previously consolidated budget line has been disaggregated by individual contract, reflecting the three distinct contracts identified.

Environmental and Social Safeguards.

If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached? (only as applicable)

Secretariat's Comments
RR (3/27/2026)

Provided

Agency's Comments
**GEFSEC DECISION
RECOMMENDATION.
Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

Secretariat's Comments
RR (4/20/2026)

Pending policy review

RR (3/27/2026)

Not yet - could you please see comments above and resubmit. Please see in particular component 2 which should be removed as it is not eligible.

REVIEW DATE(S)

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/27/2026	4/20/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		