

# Second & Third Biennial Transparency Report and Fifth National Communication on Climate Change of Panama

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11871

**Countries**

Panama

**Project Name**

Second & Third Biennial Transparency Report and Fifth National  
Communication on Climate Change of Panama

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

2/27/2025

**Review completed by PM**

3/27/2025

**Program Manager**

Toshiyuki Yamasaki

**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**

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

Yes, this project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal area strategy.

**Agency's Comments**

**Cost Ranges.**

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

**Secretariat's Comments**

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Cleared.** The project has no deviations in the cost range. The costing is in line with Information Note GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

**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**

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Yes.**

## Agency's Comments

### Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

#### Eligibility Criteria.

**Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

#### Institutional framework.

**Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

We take note that UNDP will provide partial execution services at no cost through the "National Implementation Modality". The request from the OFP and the authorization by the GEF Secretariat are uploaded in the Documents section of the project.

#### Agency's Comments

#### Monitoring and Evaluation.

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Yes.** The M&E budget for the project is \$12,000.

#### 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**

**Toshi Mar/3/2025:**

**Yes.**

**Agency Response**

**Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Toshi Mar/3/2025:**

**Yes.** This is in line with Information Note GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency's Comments

**Rio Markers.**

**Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**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**

Toshi Mar/27/2025:

Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

The project has been endorsed by the country's GEF OFP and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts in the Portal.

However, the 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 distributed back in March when we were aiming to constitute 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 get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

**Agency's Comments**

The email dated on March 7, 2025 with confirmation from GEF OFP accepting the footnote has been submitted.

**Response to Comments**

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

**Gef Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**N/A.**

Agency's Comments  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat's Comments  
**N/A.**

Agency's Comments  
**Council comments**

Secretariat's Comments  
**N/A.**

Agency's Comments  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat's Comments  
**N/A.**

Agency's Comments  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat's Comments  
**N/A.**

Agency's Comments  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat's Comments  
**N/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

Toshi Apr/10/2025:  
Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Apr/3/2025:

3) A "Technical Coordinator" and a "Project and technical team assistant" are being charged 100% to project components, when most of the tasks listed in the provided TOR refer to managing the project (70%-80%). Per Guidelines, clear Terms of Reference and definition of outputs are required, or the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD eq.)					Total (USD eq.)
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC	
		Outcome 1	Outcome 2				
Contractual services-Individual	<u>Technical coordinator</u> will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (for a total of USD94,000 USD for approx 31 months).	94,000		94,000			94,000
Contractual services-Individual	1) <u>Technical Coordinator</u> will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (22 months * 3000 USD = 66000 USD).		66,000	66,000			66,000
	1) Project and technical team Assistant to support the technical team in planning, preparing the annual POA, semi-annual/annual progress reports and support in consultation processes (16 months * 2300 USD = 36800 USD).		36,800	36,800			36,800

1), 2), 4) Cleared. Thank you.

Toshi Mar/17/2025;

1) Please delete the budget table pasted in the field of Annex B which is causing a duplication of information with the uploaded table in the CEO Approval Request PDF (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted).

2) The budget table indicates UNDP as the executing partner for all project activities. However, the Letter of Support signed by the OFP indicates that UNDP will provide execution services for the project. Please amend the budget table accordingly.

**In this regard, MiAMBIENTE and OFP request approval of implementation support services from UNDP without direct cost recovery in the project budget.**

Best regards,  
  
**RAÚL PINEDO**  
 GEF Operational Focal Point for Panama

3) A "Technical Coordinator" is being charged across components. Per Guidelines, clear Terms of Reference and definition of outputs are required, or the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. We could not find the respective TOR, instead there is a link in the ProDoc document that leads to a TOR template in the UNDP website.

4) Additionally, some budget lines are aggregated. Please disaggregate the expenditures / costs and present them in a reasonable manner including the key information and the itemized costs, so we can assess the reasonability of each one. We would suggest listing each position, be it staff/contractual services-Individual, or consultant, in one budget line with respective budget allocations by components, M&E, and/or PMC as applicable.

Contractual services-Individual	Technical coordinator will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (for a total of USD94,000 USD for approx 31 months).	94,000		94,000		94,000	UNDP
Contractual services-Individual	Technical Coordinator: will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (22 months * 3000 USD = 66000 USD). Project and technical team Assistant to support the technical team in planning, preparing the annual POA, semi-annual/annual progress reports and support in consultation processes (16 months * 2300 USD = 36800 USD).		102,800	102,800		102,800	UNDP

#### Agency's Comments

1. Thank you for your comment. The budget table has been deleted.



2. The project is Nationally Implemented (NIM) with the support from UNDP. UNDP in the GEF budget table was indicated as it is the entity undertaking budget activities at the request from the Government. UNDP will execute and provide the services for the project as stated in the LOA and previously approved by email by GEF. All documents are in the portal. But, as requested we change the column to M?ambiente which is the executing partner, accountable for the programmatic, technical and financial aspects of the project.

3. The common practice is to have standards TORs in the template. As requested, please see respective TORs uploaded in the document section. Kindly note that the Technical Coordinator is being charged only under technical components.

4. As requested, GEF table has been disaggregated. If more detailed information is needed, kindly refer to the TBWP in the Prodoc.

April 9 comment number 3): Additional TOR with detailed technical tasks is in the document section.

#### **Environmental and Social Safeguards.**

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

#### **Secretariat's Comments**

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

Yes. ESS documents have been attached. The overall project risk is categorized as low risk.

#### **Agency's Comments**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

#### **Secretariat's Comments**

Toshi Apr/10/2025:

PM recommends this EA for further processing.

Toshi Apr/3/2025:

Please address a comment above (project budget table) and resubmit.

Toshi Mar/17/2025:

Please address the comments above and resubmit. Please highlight in yellow the changes you make to the portal form for ease of revision.

#### REVIEW DATE(S)

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/3/2025</b>	<b>3/26/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/17/2025</b>	<b>4/9/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/27/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/3/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/10/2025</b>	

#### PIF CEO

##### 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

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

Yes, this project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Yes.**

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 outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Yes.**

Agency Response

## **3. Project Description Overview**

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- 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 budgeted for?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

## **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

Agency Response

## **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 focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**
- 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 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 FSP/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 design and 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

## Agency Response

### 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

## Agency Response

### 5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching

principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome 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

Agency Response

#### **5.4 Risks**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the 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 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

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

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

Yes. ESS documents have been attached. The overall project risk is categorized as low risk.

Agency Response

**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 Request

N/A.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

**Yes.** This is in line with Information Note GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

### 8.3 Source of Funds

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### 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

### Agency Response

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**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

Toshi Mar/27/2025:

Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Mar/3/2025:

The project has been endorsed by the country's GEF OFP and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts in the Portal.

However, the 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 distributed back in March when we were aiming to constitute 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 get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

### Agency Response

The email dated on March 7, 2025 with confirmation from GEF OFP accepting the footnote has been submitted.



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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 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 total project financing (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

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 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

Toshi Apr/10/2025:

Thank you, cleared.

Toshi Apr/3/2025:

3) A ?Technical Coordinator? and a ?Project and technical team assistant? are being charged 100% to project components, when most of the tasks listed in the provided TOR refer to managing the project (70%-80%). Per Guidelines, clear Terms of Reference and definition of outputs are required, or?the costs associated with the project?s execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeg.)					Total (USDeg.)
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC	
		Outcome 1	Outcome 2				
Contractual services-Individual	<u>Technical coordinator</u> will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (for a total of USD94,000 USD for <del>approx</del> 31 months).	94,000		94,000			94,000
Contractual services-Individual	1) <u>Technical Coordinator</u> ; will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (22 months * 3000 USD = 66000 USD).		66,000	66,000			66,000
	1) Project and technical team Assistant to support the technical team in planning, preparing the annual POA, semi-annual/annual progress reports and support in consultation processes (16 months * 2300 USD = 36800 USD).		36,800	36,800			36,800

1), 2), 4) Cleared. Thank you.

Toshi Mar/17/2025;

1) Please delete the budget table pasted in the field of Annex B which is causing a duplication of information with the uploaded table in the CEO Approval Request PDF (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted).

2) The budget table indicates UNDP as the executing partner for all project activities. However, the Letter of Support signed by the OFP indicates that UNDP will provide execution services for the project. Please amend the budget table accordingly.

In this regard, MiAMBIENTE and OFP request approval of implementation support services from UNDP without direct cost recovery in the project budget.

Best regards,  
  
**RAÚL PINEDO**  
 GEF Operational Focal Point for Panama

3) A "Technical Coordinator" is being charged across components. Per Guidelines, clear Terms of Reference and definition of outputs are required, or the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. We could not find the respective TOR, instead there is a link in the ProDoc document that leads to a TOR template in the UNDP website.

4) Additionally, some budget lines are aggregated. Please disaggregate the expenditures / costs and present them in a reasonable manner including the key information and the itemized costs, so we can assess the reasonability of each one. We would suggest listing each position, be it staff/contractual services-Individual, or consultant, in one budget line with respective budget allocations by components, M&E, and/or PMC as applicable.

Contractual services-Individual	Technical coordinator will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (for a total of USD94,000 USD for approx 31 months).	94,000		94,000			94,000	UNDP
Contractual services-Individual	Technical Coordinator will provide advice, expertise, quality of deliverables, and strategic vision throughout the project implementation, in addition to coordinating the technical components and management (22 months * 3000 USD = 66000 USD). Project and technical team Assistant to support the technical team in planning, preparing the annual POA, semi-annual/annual progress reports and support in consultation processes (16 months * 2300 USD = 36800 USD).		102,800	102,800			102,800	UNDP

## Agency Response

1. Thank you for your comment. The budget table has been deleted.

2. The project is Nationally Implemented (NIM) with the support from UNDP. UNDP in the GEF budget table was indicated as it is the entity undertaking budget activities at the request from the Government. UNDP will execute and provide the services for the project as stated in the LOA and previously approved by email by GEF. All documents are in the portal. But, as

requested we change the column to M?ambiente which is the executing partner, accountable for the programmatic, technical and financial aspects of the project.

3. The common practice is to have standards TORs in the template. As requested, please see respective TORs uploaded in the document section. Kindly note that the Technical Coordinator is being charged only under technical components.

4. As requested, GEF table has been disaggregated. If more detailed information is needed, kindly refer to the TBWP in the Prodoc.

**April 9 comment number 3): Additional TOR with detailed technical tasks is in the document section.**

#### **Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

#### **9. GEFSEC DECISION**

##### **9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Toshi Apr/10/2025:

PM recommends this EA for further processing.

Toshi Apr/3/2025:

Please address a comment above (project budget table) and resubmit.

Toshi Mar/17/2025:

Please address the comments above and resubmit. Please highlight in yellow the changes you make to the portal form for ease of revision.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
N/A.

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/3/2025</b>	<b>3/26/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/17/2025</b>	<b>4/9/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/27/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/3/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/10/2025</b>	