



---

CEO Approval (CEO) entry – Medium Sized Project – GEF - 6

## Strengthening Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and Adaptation Activities Transparency Framework

### Part I: Project Information

**GEF ID**

10021

**Project Type**

MSP

**Type of Trust Fund**

CBIT

**Project Title**

Strengthening Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and Adaptation Activities Transparency Framework

**Countries**

Montenegro

**Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Other Executing Partner(s)**

Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

## Climate Change

### Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Climate Change, Influencing models, Type of Engagement, Stakeholders, Communications, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Paris Agreement, Enabling Activities, Nationally Determined Contribution, Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Consultation, Information Dissemination, Participation, Partnership, Awareness Raising, Education, Beneficiaries, Civil Society, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Capacity Development, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Knowledge Exchange, Learning, Theory of change, Knowledge Generation, Professional Development, Workshop, Seminar, Course, Training

### Rio Markers

#### Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 2

#### Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

### Duration

48In Months

### Agency Fee(\$)

104,500.00

## A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
CBIT-1	Climate Change	CBIT	1,100,000.00	290,000.00
			<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>1,100,000.00</b>
				<b>290,000.00</b>

**B. Project description summary****Project Objective**

To strengthen Montenegro's national capacities through an improved MRV system to meet transparency related requirements under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Strengthening Active Stakeholder Engagement and Embedding MRV	Technical Assistance	1.1. A strengthened institutional mechanism for increased transparency	<p>1.1.1: Strengthened governance, procedures, and technical capacities in order to respond to emerging transparency requirement under the Paris Agreement</p> <p>1.1.2: Transparency Methodologies, Procedures and Guidelines (MPGs) for tracking NDCs</p> <p>1.1.3: Transparency Methodologies, Procedures and Guidelines (MPGs) for tracking adaptation activities</p> <p>1.1.4: Transparency Methodologies, Procedures and Guidelines (MPGs) for tracking climate finance</p>	CBIT	255,000.00	60,000.00

Strengthening Capacities to Implement an Enhanced Transparency Framework	Technical Assistance	2.1. Strengthened national institutions are to implement enhanced transparency	<p>2.1.1: Improved GHG inventory and projections</p> <p>2.1.2: Selected public authorities and scientific institutions capacities are built for applying MPGs in the first reporting period on national adaptation actions under article 15 of the MMR</p> <p>2.1.3: Relevant national institutions are enabled to mainstream gender into the enhanced transparency framework</p>	CBIT	305,000.00	100,000.00
Strengthening Capacities to Implement an Enhanced Transparency Framework	Technical Assistance	2.2. Strengthened Coordination and Information Exchange is institutionalized with an Enhanced Transparency Framework	<p>2.2.1: The transparency portal is strengthened and made fully operative</p> <p>2.2.2: Trainings on the use of portal information to support decision-making</p> <p>2.2.3: Feedback on the project implementation, results and lessons learned are shared through the Global Coordination Platform</p>	CBIT	316,000.00	60,000.00

Strengthening Capacities to Implement an Enhanced Transparency Framework	Technical Assistance	2.3. A Technical Roadmap on Low Carbon Development Strategy is Developed and Adopted	2.3.1: A technical roadmap for a National LCDS is drafted in line with the enhanced transparency framework	CBIT	117,000.00	30,000.00
M&E				CBIT	8,000.00	21,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					1,001,000.00	271,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				CBIT	99,000.00	19,000.00
Sub Total(\$)					99,000.00	19,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)					1,100,000.00	290,000.00

**C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Government of Montenegro	In-kind	250,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	40,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)			290,000.00

## D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	CBIT	Montenegro	Climate Change		No	1,100,000	104,500
Total Grant Resources(\$)						1,100,000.00	104,500.00



**E. Non Grant Instrument**

**NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement**

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

## Core Indicators

## Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		210		
Male		210		
Total	0	420	0	0

## PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

### 1. Project Description

A.1.1: No change

A.1.1: No change

A.1.2: The baseline was updated to reflect the recently completed Second Biennial Update Report and progress made since the formulation and approval of the PIF on drafting preliminary gender-disaggregated indicators for climate change.

A.1.3: Whereas the PIF has advanced a recommended institutional mechanism to be created (Climate Action Task Force based on consultations and expectations during the PIF formulation phase, during the project formulation phase, stakeholders agreed to let the project during its early implementation make a final determination on the nature of the strengthened institutional mechanism for improved MRV transparency. As a result, Output was revised to be less prescriptive, allowing the project's SWOT and Gap analysis and subsequent consultations and negotiations with key stakeholders to take place first.

For the purposes of organization and clarity, but without any substantive changes, the PIF outcomes and outputs have been reworded slightly. The outcomes in the PIF were framed as activities since they each began with a verb, e.g., “embed”, “enable”, “adopt”, and “develop”. The purpose was to have tighter language without losing substance, and to reflect the results of consultations during the prodoc formulation missions, in particular the validation workshop that required that the first outcome not prejudice the creation of a task force that did not benefit from the broader stakeholder consultations and assessments that must precede such a decision.

Outcome 2.3 was expanded to include the formulation of a resource mobilization strategy to complement the technical roadmap to implement the Low Carbon Development Strategy that will be prepared by a parallel project.

M&E is shown now as a separate item in the table B. This caused that budgets under Outcome 3 and 4 are slightly reduced against the budget in the PIF.

A.1.4: The total co-financing was increased from US\$ 275,000 to US\$ 290,000. Previously identified co-financing by the Hungarian project was not included as it is now more accurately part of the baseline of parallel co-financing, which is not measured for the purposes of incremental financing.

UNDP is providing an important cash contribution of US\$ 40,000 to supplement the limited funds available for project management, recognizing the importance of having clear distinction between the GEF allocation for technical and management componets.

A.1.5: No change

A.1.6: No change

**A.2. Child Project?**

**If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.**

N/A

### A.3. Stakeholders

#### Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

A number of consultations took place during the project document formulation phase. These consultations served to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges and barriers that limit Montenegro's ability to collect and manage data and information in ways that sustainable development can be better informed by best practices to conserve global environmental values. That is, the limited capacities that currently define Montenegro's economy are informed by the various social actors and their work towards meeting the project's objectives. A number of government organizations and other institutions were consulted

The engagement of the National Council offers an appropriate channel for the MSDT to highlight mitigation and adaptation related trends, challenges and priorities at a high political level. As a climate-change working group secretariat for this Council, the MSDT could take on responsibilities for producing regular updates on indicators and analysis to inform wider stakeholders and decision makers. The MSDT could develop communication and awareness-raising activities on mitigation and adaptation related trends, challenges and priorities at a high political level and to the public, as well as to public and private decision makers. Further engagement could focus on using climate data of relevance and of interest from the MRV system and linking climate actions to wider joint benefits (the economy, health, ecosystems, flood protection, water quality, energy security, etc.)

Based on the experience in producing the national communications and biennial update report, it is understood that the most effective way to address climate change is to ensure involvement of all stakeholders (academic sector, private sector, NGO sector and relevant Ministries and state agencies) in both design and implementation of the climate change-related actions through focused discussion and working groups. The integration of the different sectors strengthen the institutional and technical capacity of different stakeholders and institutions and ensures the achievement of optimal sectoral coverage and relevance of the actions and enhances their sustainability. In addition to that, the national knowledge, and awareness of the different stakeholders have been increased, in particular those from the government, non-government, private and academic sectors.

Stakeholder	Role in CBIT project
Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Institute of Hydrometeorology and Seismology is the focal point of both the IPC C and the UNFCCC, and, on behalf of the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, is responsible for overseeing activities related to climate issues in Montenegro. It is thus in charge of the elaboration of climate change policy, the national adaptation plan, the GHG inventory, MRV activities and reporting to the UNFCCC. The role of the DCC will be the overall coordination of the activities defined by the project, the design of the transparency framework implementation and ensuring efficient communication with the other stakeholders. For example, particular attention will be given to formalizing lines of communication between and among key and other relevant government agencies, namely the particularly Ministry of Economy (ME), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Environment and Nature Protection Agency (ENPA), State Statistical Office (MONSTAT), Institute for Hydrometeorology and Seismology (IHMS), Institute for Public Health (IPH). A number of workshops and roundtable discussions</li> </ul>

	<p>ions will be organized with parliamentarians, with the involvement of other stakeholders, such as government agencies, academia, CSOs, journalists. This should result in improved integration of climate change considerations into other sectoral policies and plans and will lead to the improved implementation of the overall climate change policy. The MSDT it will take the leading role in the WGMA work under component 1, as well as through the work on component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation), be involved in all training activities and climate awareness, and play a key role in the portal integration of the data, methodologies and tools generated through this GEF/CBIT. As the first user of the envisioned transparency portal, DCC technical experts will play a key role in making the platform user-friendly. Their experts will be trained in data quality improvement, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of adaptation actions, involvement gender in adaptation actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Environment and Nature Protection Agency (ENPA), currently in MSDT, is in charge of the GHG inventory development. ENPA's role in the project will be as part of the coordination system for public institutions. Members will be trained in data collection and data quality improvement, implementation of Quality Assurance/Quality Control procedures and uncertainty assessments. The ENPA experts will be involved in standardizing the format for data, requesting development and setting up the LCDS framework.</li> <li>· The sector in charge of environmental IT within MSDT will generate part of the coordination system for public institutions to be established under Outcome 2.1. The IT experts will be trained on how to insert, use and share data to the portal.</li> <li>· The Directorate for Waste Management and Communal Development is in charge of the country's waste policy. Its expertise will be important in designing, strengthening the functioning of the WGMA under component 1 and part of component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation). The waste experts will be trained in waste data quality improvement and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in waste sector, gender involvement in waste planning and projects, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of mitigation and adaptation actions.</li> <li>· The Directorate for EU Integration and International Cooperation is in charge of climate finance of the country, the GEF, the GCF, and the focal point for the Adaptation Fund. Its expertise will be important for the work of the WGMA under component 1, as well as some work on component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation).</li> </ul>
Ministry of Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Directorate for Energy is in charge of energy policy of the country. Thereby, its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA the under component 1, as well as through the work on component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation). The energy experts will be trained in energy data quality improvement and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in the energy sector, gender</li> </ul>

	<p>overnment and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in the energy sector, gender involvement in energy planning and projects, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of mitigation and adaptation actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Directorate for Industry and Entrepreneurship is in charge of industrial policy of the country. Thereby, its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA under component 1, as well as through the work on component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation). The industry experts will be trained in industry data quality improvement and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in the industry sector, gender involvement in industrial planning and projects, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of mitigation and adaptation actions.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Rural Development and Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Directorate for Agriculture is in charge of agricultural policy of the country. Thereby, its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA under component 1, as well as through the work on component 2 the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation). The agricultural experts will be trained in agriculture data quality improvement and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in the agriculture sector, gender involvement in agricultural planning and projects, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of mitigation and adaptation actions.</li> <li>· The Directorate for Forestry is in charge of forest policy of the country. Thereby, its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA under component 1, as well as through the work on component 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCD S framework preparation). The forestry experts will be trained in forestry data quality improvement and supply, the use of tools for GHG projections in forestry sector, gender involvement in forestry planning and projects, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of mitigation and adaptation actions.</li> </ul>
MONSTAT – State Statistical Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The institution in charge of state statistics. Due to its significant reach to generate data on a national level, it will be the main partner to process and supply data for GHG inventory calculation and to develop the gender database. Staff will be trained in data quality improvement and data processing for GHG inventory calculation, in the use of an advanced gender data gathering tool, set-up gender indicators and establishment of gender database.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Internal Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Directorate for Emergency is in charge of Disaster Risk Reduction. Its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA under component 1. The MIA experts will be trained in data quality improvement, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of adaptation actions.</li> </ul>
Institute for Public Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The institution in charge of public health. Thereby, its expertise will be important in the work of the WGMA under component 1, as well as through the work on component</li> </ul>



	nt 2 (the transparency portal development and the LCDS framework preparation). The IPH experts will be trained in data quality improvement, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of adaptation actions, and involvement of gender in adaptation actions.
Academia, universities, scientific institutions	· The expertise of these non-state actors will play an important role in all activities concerning capacity building and participative processes under both components. They will also be represented in the WGMA. To date, the University of Montenegro (UoM) has been most involved in climate change activities, whereas the University of Donja Gorica (UDG) has also been involved with the Council. The UDG recently established The Center for Climate Change, Natural Resources and Energy (CCCRNE), which is another important stakeholder.
NGO sector	· The Coalition 27 (20 associated NGOs) is conceived as an open platform for joint monitoring and participation of civil society organizations in the process of representation and promotion of European attainments in the field of environment and climate change in Montenegro. The coalition will contribute to the quality and transparency of the negotiation process through its activities, and in the long run, to institutional capacity building for those taking care of the environment. The aim of the coalition is to contribute to the quality, transparency and faster implementation of EU requirements under Negotiating Chapter 27. Its expertise will take important role in all activities concerning WGMA and participative processes under both components.

## Documents Title

Submitted

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier; Yes

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

**Other (Please explain)**

#### A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

The project document benefits from important advancements in the consideration of gender-disaggregated indicators for climate change, which include the drafting of preliminary indicators that output 2.3 of this project will pick up from. This requirement is specifically called by the Paris Agreement and thus is part of the project design. The project will recruit a consultant that will best have the kind of expertise to undertake this kind of work. He/she will also participate in activities other than those under 2.3 in order the gender equality priorities have an upstream influence, those reflecting a truly integrated approach. For example, this would take place in the learning-by-doing workshops on the formulation of methodologies, procedures, and guidelines for tracking NDC, adaptation efforts, and climate finance. Notwithstanding that women make up a significant percentage of the government bureaucracy dealing with environment (e.g., at the project document validation workshop women made up over 80% of the participants and with leadership positions). The percent of women and men direct beneficiaries are expected to be 50/50. The gender analysis can be found in section A.4.5 of the project document, with an additional section (C.6) that outlines gender equality and the preliminary gender action plan in Annex G.

Documents	Title	Submitted
-----------	-------	-----------

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

#### Annex G: Gender Analysis and Action Plan

On a national scale, robust efforts are being made to meet the needs of vulnerable populations, including women. The Action Plan for Achieving Gender Equality (2013-2017) was recently implemented. Besides the Action Plan, various studies related to the status of women in Montenegro have been produced in recent years, including the socio-economic status of women in Montenegro and women in politics.

Montenegro generally has a good legislative framework that ensures gender equality and equal access to opportunities. It also developed the appropriate institutional framework in order to promote gender equality, based on national legislation and the international instruments on human rights, as well as other legal documents of the UN, CoE, EU and other international organizations concerned with equality between women and men.

It is important to point out that the Gender Equality Committee of the Parliament of Montenegro and the Office for Gender Equality have both been established, and there is also an institute of the Ombudsman. However, there is no ultimate political will to empower women and achieve gender equality. The resources allocated are symbolic. There is still a lack of personal sensibility and existence of stereotypical gender regimes of skilled workers, judges, prosecutors and other responsible actors, which is caused by the continuous problem in the implementation of law.

In addition, the UNDP's Country Office in Montenegro, in collaboration with the Government of Montenegro, has identified the following priority areas for intervention that were listed in the Montenegro's Action Plan for Achieving Gender Equality 2017-2021:

A regional workshop held in the Republic of North Macedonia in December 2017 with the support of the CBIT Global Support Programme facilitating learning-by-doing integration of gender considerations into MRV/transparency processes in the Western Balkan Countries. This produced a preliminary draft gender action plan (See below).

Through the GEF/CBIT funds and in particular through output 2.1.3., Montenegro will establish long and short-term planning for integration of gender and climate considerations, build technical skills for gender data differentiation, improve statistical infrastructure (sampling frames, classifications, documented concepts, definitions and methods) and establish sex-disaggregated data management (archiving, analysis, and dissemination).

Based on high-quality, robust gender disaggregated data, the WGMA will be able to make well-informed policy planning decisions that consider differences in gender, and thus better inform climate action.

Preliminary Draft Gender Action Plan on Climate MRV (December 2017).

Objective	Activity	Responsible Institution	Timeframe	Budget Source	Indicator
Improve climate change (CC) related legislation framework with gender perspective	Mainstream gender into the draft Law on CC	Ministry for Sustainable Development and Tourism (MSDT) – Directorate for Climate Change (DCC), in cooperation with working group on law preparation and Ministry for Human Rights (MHR)	II quarter of 2019	DCC + UNDP + EU	Law adopted in National Parliament
	Mainstreaming gender into related by-laws to be developed	MSDT – DCC, in cooperation with MHR	Six months from law adoption – end of 2019 – beginning of 2020	CBIT?	By-laws adopted
	Mainstream gender into National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS) and Low	MSDT - DCC	Revision of NCCS planned for 2020.	CBIT + IPA	Revised NCCS mainstreamed with gender component

	Carbon Development Strategy				
	Update National Gender Strategy with Climate Change related issues	MHR, in cooperation with DCC			CC mainstreamed within the National Gender Strategy
Strengthen national institutions to mainstream gender into the climate change transparency framework	Assessment of relevant national capacities and needs	DCC and UNDP	II half of 2019	CBIT?	Assessment with recommendations for improvements developed
	Set of trainings on CC and Gender (train DCC in gender issues and vice versa)	DCC, MHR, relevant NGOs from both sectors	2020	CBIT?	No. of training organized, no. of people trained and using both quantitative and qualitative indicators
	Nominate (educate/train) gender representative into the Working Group on Climate Change	MSDT – DCC + Secretariat of the National Council on Sustainable Development and Climate Change	2020	CBIT?	Gender person member of the working group on climate change

Objective	Activity	Responsible Institution	Timeframe	Budget Source	Indicator
Improve sex-disaggregated data in the context of climate change	Analysis of existing and needed data including recommendations for data to be collected	DCC and UNDP	Second half of 2019 and 2020	CBIT	Analysis developed
	Collect sex-disaggregated data related to specific mitigation and adaptation measures	DCC, MONSTAT	2020/2021	IPA/CBIT	Relevant data collected
	Use collected data for relevant policy making	MSDT - DCC	2021		Relevant national strategies and plans have taken into consideration collected data

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

## A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

Risk Log Matrix				
<i>Impact (I) – 6 highest, 1 lowest; Probability (P) – 6 highest, 1 lowest</i>				
	Description	Category	Impact & Probability	Counter measures / Management response
1	Insufficient participation of key institutions	Political	Despite the high political commitment to the issues covered by the project, to a limited extent, government departments operate in silos. The risk will be largely limited to slow down progress due to increased need and time to consult and reach consensus on key issues. I = 2; P = 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is designed to address the risk of government bodies taking a silo approach through the very first activity that will include, among others, an assessment of the challenges, opportunities, and propose recommendations to address insufficient engagement</li> <li>The learning-by-doing activities of the project will create ample opportunities to engage the various sectoral institutions that are currently involved in processes and activities related to climate change. Through these, they will be better enabled to collaborate in strengthening the country's transparency framework for MRV.</li> </ul>
2.	Poor project coordination and limited alignment among government agencies	Operational	Limited ability of government agencies to coordinate actions, delaying project implementation. I = 2; P = 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is specifically designed to support government, among other stakeholders as appropriate, in order to build MRV capacities and the development of a transparency portal.</li> </ul>
3.	Government bodies have a limited number of technical experts at their disposal. As a result, there is insufficient ability to carry out all the technical work that is needed, especially when new expertise is called upon.	Operational	Project implementation would be delayed in order to allow time for current staff experts to carry out the required work. I = 4; P = 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working within existing parameters, the project will strengthen existing institutional mechanisms and technical capacities through learning-by-doing trainings in order that a greater number of current staff has more experience in applying methodologies, procedures, and guidelines for increased transparency in mitigation, adapt</li> </ul>

				<p>ation, and climate finance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The learning-by-doing trainings under the project are designed to facilitate the long-term adoption of the new technical tools and related knowledge by associated stakeholders.</li> <li>· The project will facilitate the signing of memoranda of agreements that is intended to enhance inter-agency coordination and collaboration, thus seizing opportunities to create cost-effective synergies in implementing best practice MRV</li> <li>· The project will mobilize support from regional partners to expand the pool of available expertise.</li> </ul>
4.	The institutional set up strengthened by the project will not be sustainable beyond the end of the project implementation period due to lack of financial and institutional support	Operational and Regulatory	Delay in institutionalizing recommended reforms. I = 4; P = 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The project will avoid creating new institutional mechanisms but rather focus on strengthening existing ones, that already enjoy good political commitment</li> <li>· The WGMA is a key institutional mechanism that already has the mandate to monitor implementation of the Paris Agreement, with the project providing technical support to the secretariat staff as needed and as requested.</li> <li>· The project is specifically designed to support existing institutional arrangements that are most likely to have the necessary political and financial commitments.</li> <li>· Outcome 2.3 specifically calls for a resource mobilization strategy to be prepared to support the financial sustainability of the transparency portal</li> </ul>



5.	Change of implementation modality from DIM to NIM	Operational	Possible delays in project implementation due to lack of prior experience of MSDT officials in management of GEF funded projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along with the project implementation, capacity building of designated officials in implementation of GEF projects should be organized.</li> </ul>
6.	Impact of Covid 19 pandemics and post recovery	Operational	The project implementation might be slowed down due to the Covid 19 pandemics (e.g. on-line mode of work)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-line work is becoming more and more usual mode of work, government stakeholders are also getting used to this type of work. On-line work will be applied until circumstances allow for going back to business as usual. Thus, the situation will be closely monitored, so that adaptive measures can be implemented when the time comes.</li> </ul>

## A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

**Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

The project will be implemented according to the National Implementation (NIM) modality, with the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism as Implementing Partner. The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of the resources.

The Implementing Partner is responsible for:

- Upon review and recommendation of the Project Board, approving and signing the multiyear workplan;
- Approving and signing the combined delivery report at the end of the year; and
- Signing the financial report or the funding authorization and certificate of expenditures.
- Project planning, coordination, management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting. This includes providing all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes and is aligned with national systems so that the data used and generated by the project supports national systems.
- Risk management as outlined in this Project Document;
- Procurement of goods and services, including human resources;
- Financial management, including overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets;

UNDP will be accountable to GEF for the implementation of this project. This will include oversight of project execution to ensure that the project is carried out in accordance with agreed standards and provisions. UNDP will be responsible for delivering GEF project cycle management services, comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation. UNDP will have the Project Assurance role within the Project Board/Steering Committee. A strict firewall will be maintained between project oversight costs and personnel (called implementation by the GEF) and implementation of the project costs and personnel (called execution by the GEF).

UNDP will also provide project cycle management services that will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- 
- Overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets,
- Ensuring that activities including procurement and financial services are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures,
- Ensuring that the reporting to GEF is undertaken in line with the GEF requirements and procedures,

- Facilitating project learning, exchange and outreach within the GEF family,
- Commissioning the project's final evaluation and triggering additional reviews and/or evaluations as necessary and in consultation with the project counterparts.

The MSDT will nominate a high level official who will serve as the National Project Director (NPD) for the project implementation. The NPD will chair the Project Board and other relevant stakeholder, sectoral and working groups under the project, and be responsible for providing government oversight and guidance to the project implementation. The NPD, in addition to the Project Board members will not be paid from the project funds, but will represent a Government in-kind contribution to the Project. The Directorate for Climate Change within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism will be in charge of future climate activities in the country

The Project Board will be responsible for making management decisions by consensus when guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendations for Implementing Partner (IP) approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure IP's ultimate accountability, decisions will be made in accordance with standards that will ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. Project Board meetings will be organized at least twice per year, and if necessary on more frequent basis. The membership of the Project Board will be determined at the time of project implementation on the basis of their official nomination from the participating government bodies.

The Project Manager will run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager function will end when the final project report and documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

The project assurance role will be provided by the UNDP Montenegro's Programme Officer. Additional quality assurance will be provided by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor as needed. The main project partners/beneficiaries will be included in the Project Management Board. In addition, the project will target general public through set of public awareness raising activities.

#### Coordination

There are a number of on-going initiatives related to transparency as a whole or through components directed towards MRV (See Table 2, Section D.3 in the project document). The Department of Climate Change in the MSDT and the WGMA will ensure that efficient use of resources across initiatives is ensured, alignment in activities and outputs guaranteed, and that potential future initiatives will fit neatly with the ongoing initiatives, thereby ensuring synergies and avoiding duplication. Additionally, since the MSDT is participating in all the projects as coordinator, there will be a constant check of the activities and the synergies that can be created among initiatives.

Planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives: The Project Board will facilitate the coordination between this project, other GEF projects, as well as non-GEF initiatives such as the Hungarian Klimapolitika project on the preparation of a framework for the establishment of a national system for policy and projection policies. This latter project focuses on the energy and industrial sectors with the application of the Integrated MARKAL-EFOM System (TIMES) model, including electricity, heating in households, and industry; but it will not cover other sectors, such as waste, agriculture, transport, and forestry.

The Working Group on Mitigation and Adaptation, as a national mechanism to advise the National Council on Sustainable Development and Tourism, is another key mechanism that will ensure the appropriate coordination of activities from this project and various initiatives.

This project will facilitate the signing of memoranda of agreements that is intended to enhance inter-agency coordination and collaboration, thus seizing opportunities to create cost-effective synergies in implementing best practice MRV.

Donor/Partner and Project	Timeframe	Focus Area
GEF-UNDP The Third National Communication (TNC)	07/2016-10/2020	Reporting to the UNFCCC
GEF-UNDP The Second Biennial Update Report (SBUR)	11/2016-04/2019	Reporting to the UNFCCC
GCF National Adaptation Plan (NAP)	12/2020-12/2022	Adaptation planning
EU/Klimapolitika - Human Dynamics Regional Implementation of the Paris Agreement (RIPAP)	11/2017-12/2018	MRV in Emissions Trading System
Hungarian government/Naturaqua Establishment of a national system for policy and measures The National Adaptation Geo-Information System (GIS)	12/2017-06/2018	Mitigation and Adaptation

Table 2: Key complementary projects

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

#### A.7. Benefits

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?**

A socio-economic analysis of investments pertaining to the ratification of the Paris Agreement covered all the investments in three of Montenegro's sectors (energy, industry and agriculture) needed to achieve NDC mitigation goal, as well as the sources and amounts of funding for each particular investment was undertaken in 2017 (Đurović, Perović, & Jablan, 2017). The main purpose of the socio-economic analysis was to explore whether the ratification of Paris Agreement would have a positive net contribution/effect for a wider community (in order to achieve long-term sustainability, including economic and wider social development) and that it is therefore worth being implemented. In line with this study, funding priority investment projects for period 2017-2030 amounts to € 1,754 million, of which 91% will be derived from investors and the remainder of 9% from public funds. This work is an important indication of the socio-economic benefits that Montenegro has already broached in deciding to strengthen capacities for improved transparency under this project.

Whereas the global environmental benefits are defined by the project's capacity building activities to meet obligations under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, socio-economic benefits are more indirect. Rather, these are largely through the better information and decisions that are intended to result through improved transparency, reporting, and programmatic guidance to pursue low-carbon and climate resilient development. Importantly, the exchanges that will be facilitated by the CBIT Global Support Programme and other development partners such as the European Union, the socio-economic benefits of alternative mitigation and adaptation options will be promoted (See outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, and 2.3.1).

## A.8. Knowledge Management

**Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.**

Knowledge management constitutes a core element of Montenegro's GEF/CBIT project and reflects country's general approach to public policy-making. Montenegro will engage key stakeholders in a two-fold way: through the WGMA and the transparency portal.

As part of the former, all relevant actors within the WGMA will convene regularly as part of the cross-sectoral working group, in order to share expertise, experiences, the MRV implementation advancements, challenges, etc. These exchanges between sectors have historically been missing in Montenegro and, thereby, the WGMA group will close a significant gap.

The transparency portal, extensively described in the alternative scenario, will play a key role in making available knowledge associated with data generation and analysis. The easy-to-use digital library of methodologies and models will be designed based on the notion of general access and accessibility, meaning that the knowledge will not only be available but also be useful to a broad audience. It can be envisioned that the transparency portal will be made accessible to the international audience as part of GEF/CBIT's global activities.

Montenegro through this project aspires to share its MRV framework and transparency, and specifically the GEF/CBIT project lessons, widely with the international community to foster the global knowledge base and facilitate cross-fertilization. As described in more detail before, Montenegro envisions producing outputs with exemplary character: (I) the WGMA; (II) the transparency portal for data generation and analysis methods and methodologies; (III) the introduction of big data to transparency, with particular attention to gender data; and (IV) the LCDS framework.

Montenegro believes that sharing these experiences through GEF/CBIT's global activities, workshops, webinars, bilateral exchanges, among others, will support other developing countries in fostering their national MRV systems.

**B. Description of the consistency of the project with:****B.1. Consistency with National Priorities**

**Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.**

Montenegro's proposed actions to be funded by GEF Programme Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (GEF/CBIT) are in line with national strategies and plans, specifically its national development strategy. This proposal is aligned with the national priorities and capacity building needs identified outlined in the Second Biennial Update Report (SBUR) and the Third National Communication (TNC), as well as the report on the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). Indeed, Montenegro's priorities to improve reporting under the UNFCCC go further back to when the Initial National Communication to the UNFCCC and the First Biennial Report were prepared in 2011.

This GEF/CBIT project will help transition the currently established MRV framework to an enhanced transparency framework, in line with the Paris Agreement. The project is aligned with the commitments expressed in Montenegro's NDC and will be critical to ensure the trust and implementation of the targets and activities there included. The actions proposed in is expected that the actions proposed will greatly accelerate capacity building and the overall capability of Montenegro to generate biennial information that is transparent, consistent, complete and accurate. This proposal is aligned with the National Sustainable Development Strategy of Montenegro that mentions the fight against climate change as a cross-cutting element.

The established transparency system and enhanced capacities through this project will contribute in tracking the progress of implementation of the SDGs. By ensuring data quality of national and sectoral information, the national GHG inventory included in the biennial update reports and national communications, as well as the mitigation actions reported in the SBUR, will be more accurate and transparent. With these actions, Montenegro seeks to ensure high quality data that will be used by the Working Group on Mitigation and Adaptation to assess progress towards the NDC and for forecasting future emissions, also to assess potential gaps in climate change policy. Montenegro will be in a position to report biennially on the most important source categories at the national level through biennial update reports, with more complete information in the national communications as well as the latest available GHG indicators, trends, and projects in the NDC reports.

**C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:**

The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP and UNDP Evaluation Policy. The UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the GEF M&E policy and other relevant GEF policies.

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.

**M&E oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

**Project Manager:** The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The Project Manager will ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP/GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF (Project Implementation Report) PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender action plan, stakeholder engagement plan etc..) occur on a regular basis.

**Project Board:** The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.

**Project Implementing Partner:** The Implementing Partner is responsible for providing all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes, and is aligned with national systems so that the data used and generated by the project supports national systems.



UNDP Country Office: The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This will be funded by UNDP cash contribution to the project.

The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP. This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g., annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager.

The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure to support ex post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

UNDP/GEF Unit: Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP/GEF Directorate as needed.

Audit: The project will be audited as per UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on direct implementation projects.

Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

- i) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project strategy and implementation;
- ii) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
- iii) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
- iv) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF Operational Focal Point in M&E;
- v) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; SESP, Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; project grievance mechanisms; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
- vi) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
- vii) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first-year annual work plan.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

A project initiation workshop will be conducted within the first two months of project start with the full project team, Project Board members, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP Country Office, with representation from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as appropriate. Non-governmental stakeholders should be represented at this workshop.

A fundamental objective of this initiation workshop will be to further instill an understanding and ownership of the project's goals and objectives among the project team, government and other stakeholder groups. The workshop also serves to finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the project's log-frame matrix. This will include reviewing the log frame (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalize the Annual Work Plan with precise and measurable performance (process and output) indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. The log frame will be reviewed and, in consultation with an international CCCD expert recruited under the project, updated to include relevant gender equality indicators.

Specifically, the project initiation workshop will: (i) introduce project staff to the UNDP/GEF expanded team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the UNDP Country Office and responsible Project Management Unit (PMU) staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP Country Office and PMU staff with respect to the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP/GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the combined Annual Performance Report - Project Implementation Report (APR/PIRs), Project Board meetings, as well as final evaluation. The initiation workshop will also provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing.

The initiation workshop will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for PMU staff and associated consultative and decision-making structures will be reviewed and clarified.

The initiation workshop will present a schedule of M&E-related meetings and reports. The Project Manager in consultation with UNDP will develop this schedule, which will include tentative time frames for Project Board meetings. The schedule will also include the timing of near-term project activities, such as the in-depth review of literature, and project-related monitoring and evaluation activities. The provisional work plan will be approved in the first meeting of the Project Board.

A project initiation report will be prepared immediately following the initiation workshop. This report will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames as well as detailed activities and performance indicators that will guide project implementation (over the course of the first year). This Work Plan will include the proposed dates for any visits and/or support missions from the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project decision-making structures (i.e., Project Board). The report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months' time-frame.

The initiation report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation, including any unforeseen or newly arisen constraints. When finalized, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in that to respond with comments or queries.

The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and will be approved by the Project Board.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The tracking tool for this project is the Capacity Development Scorecard, which outlines a set of 15 indicators. The Capacity Development Scorecard will be used to monitor global environmental benefits. A baseline assessment of the scorecard was prepared by national stakeholders during a focus group, and annexed to the present project document. At the time of the terminal evaluation, the scorecard will be completed through stakeholder consultations and a focus group meeting. The terminal evaluation will include a comparative analysis of the baseline and end-of-project scorecards to make a number of appropriate inferences and conclusions. As a medium-sized project, there will not be a mid-term evaluation.

Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP Country Office through the provision of quarterly reports from the Project Manager. Furthermore, specific meetings may be scheduled between the PMU, the UNDP Country Office and other pertinent stakeholders as deemed appropriate and relevant (particularly the Project Board members). Such meetings will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

Annual Monitoring will occur through the Project Board meeting. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to Project Board meetings at least twice per year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months following the initiation workshop. For each year-end meeting of the Project Board, the Project Manager will prepare harmonized Annual Performance Report / Project Implementation Report (APR/PIR) and submit it to UNDP Country Office, the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit, and all Project Board members at least two weeks prior to the meeting for review and comments.

The APR/PIR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the Project Board year-end meeting. The Project Manager will present the APR/PIR to the Project Board members, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the Committee participants. The Project Manager will also inform the participants of any agreement(s) reached by stakeholders during the APR/PIR preparation, on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project output may also be conducted, as necessary. Details regarding the requirements and conduct of the APR and Project Board meetings are contained with the M&E Information Kit available through UNDP/GEF.

Terminal Evaluation: An independent terminal evaluation will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the evaluation report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final terminal evaluation report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office for GEF-financed projects and made available on the website of UNDP IEO's Evaluation Resource Center. As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will have been deemed to meet the criteria of independent, impartial and rigorous. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and

consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP/GEF Directorate. The final terminal evaluation report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and will be approved by the Project Board. The terminal evaluation report will be publicly available in English on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center.

The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre. Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the terminal evaluation report, and rate the quality of the terminal evaluation report. The assessment report will be sent to the GEF Independent Evaluation Office, along with the project terminal evaluation report.

Final Report: The project's terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package will be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

#### Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and Budget:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget (US\$)		Time frame
		Total GEF grant	Total UNDP Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	IP	5,000	None	One workshop to be carried out within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	Project Manager Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager	None	None	Annually, before PIR
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Manager UNDP Country Office UNDP/GEF team	None	None	Annually
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager	3,000	1,000	Annually (as part of project progress reports)
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going
Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Project Manager	None	None	On-going
Gender Action Plan	Project Manager UNDP GEF team	None	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going
				Twice per year, finance

<b>Project Board meetings</b>	Project Board Project Manager	None	None	d through Government i n-kind contribution
<b>Supervision missions</b>	UNDP Country Office	None	None	To be determined
<b>Oversight missions</b>	UNDP/GEF team	None	None	Troubleshooting as nee ded
<b>GEF Secretariat learning missi ons/site visits</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP/GEF team	None	None	To be determined
<b>Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be prepared by independent fi nal evaluator</b>	Independent Final Eva luation Consultant Project Manager	None	None	As part the terminal ev aluation mission
<b>Independent Terminal Evaluati on included in UNDP evaluati on plan, and management res ponse</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP/GEF team	None	20,000	At least three months b efore operational closu re
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and t ravel expenses		<i>US\$ 8,000</i>	<i>US\$ 21,000</i>	

**PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)****A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

<b>GEF Agency Coordinator</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	5/14/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	5/14/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	5/14/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	5/14/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	6/20/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	8/2/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	8/2/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	10/18/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	10/18/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	10/18/2019	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	9/29/2020	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	9/29/2020	Damiano Borgogno	8502882627	damiano.borgogno@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	3/15/2021	Eszter Baricz		eszter.baricz@undp.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts					
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:					
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> By 2021, the people of Montenegro are benefiting from sustainable management of cultural and natural resources, combating climate change, and disaster-risk reduction.</p> <p><b>Outcome 4:</b> By 2021, national, state and local institutions are more effective to carry out their mandates including strengthened normative frameworks that respect human rights and fundamental freedoms and ensure effective service delivery</p>					
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 1.4: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented.					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><b>Project Objective</b></p> <p>To strengthen Montenegro's national capacities through an improved MTRV system to meet transparency related requirements under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement</p>	<p><b>Mandatory Indicator 1:</b> IRRF 1.4.2 - Extent to which implementation of comprehensive measures, i.e., plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives has improved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not adequately</li> <li>2. Very partially</li> <li>3. Partially</li> <li>4. Largely</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing coordination and formal mechanisms are inadequate. The many solutions to combat climate change and achieve the sustainable management of natural resources are only available within the construct of externally-funded projects. Thus, the baseline of this indicator is effectively one: not adequately.</li> <li>While a number of national stakeholders are benefitting from various climate change projects, the baseline is set at zero as the trainings under the project will provide new and expanded skills</li> <li>The existing institutional structures and mechanisms for data an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated</li> <li>One new cooperation mechanism is established, i.e., the National Council for Sustainable, Climate Change, and Integrated Coastal Zone Management, targeted to catalyzing Rio Convention mainstreaming at the directorate level among stakeholder agencies and organizations. Thus, coordination will have improved from a rating of 1 (not adequately) to 3 (partially).</li> <li>At least 420 different stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Minutes [1]</li> <li>Working group and workshop reports and products [2]</li> <li>UNDP quarterly progress reports</li> <li>Annual Project Implementation Reports</li> <li>Independent final evaluation report</li> <li>Resource mobilization strategy</li> <li>Training program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government ministries and authorities maintain political commitment to the project</li> <li>The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner</li> <li>Non-state stakeholders, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project</li> <li>Policy and institutional</li> </ul>

			<p>... and mechanisms for data and information management are out of date and hinder by limited data sharing.</p> <p>...holders have benefitted directly from project activities, of which 210 (or 50%) are women.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional and technical capacities to use data and information for planning and decision-making based on better climate models and information</li> </ul>	me	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible</li> <li>• There is a commitment of the relevant government agencies and their staffs to actively engage in project activities</li> <li>• Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project</li> </ul>
<p>Outcome <sup>[3]</sup> 1:</p> <p><b>A strengthened institutional mechanism for increased transparency</b></p>	<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Number of meetings of the institutional mechanism strengthened under output 1.1.</p> <p><b>Indicator 4:</b> Number of stakeholder institutions that actively participated in the learning-by-doing workshops</p> <p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Number of stakeholder institutions accessing or providing inputs to the knowledge sharing information system from transparency initiatives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Council for Sustainable Development, Climate Change, and Integrated Coastal Zone Management was established in 2016, with four working groups to support work of the Council.</li> <li>• Although the working group dealing with climate change meets between two and four times per year, its technical expertise remains inadequate to inform decision-makers.</li> <li>• Montenegro ratified the Law on Ratification of the Paris Agreement in October 2017.</li> <li>• Staffs from key government agencies and stakeholder organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter-agency memoranda of agreements are signed by month 24</li> <li>• Background material for the development of transparency methodologies, procedures, and guidelines for mitigation, adaptation, and climate finance specific to Montenegro have been collated and validated by stakeholders and officially approved by month 11</li> <li>• Transparency methodologies, procedures, and guidelines for mitigation, adaptation, and climate finance specific to Montenegro have been de</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWOT and gap analysis report</li> <li>• Signed memoranda of agreements</li> <li>• Meeting minutes</li> <li>• Tracking and progress reports</li> <li>• Participant registration lists</li> <li>• Workshop reports</li> <li>• Annual Progress Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strengthened institutional mechanism is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions</li> <li>• The government remains politically committed to the strengthened institutional mechanism and facilitates its institutionalization</li> </ul>



		<p>ons are not adequately trained in transparency methodologies, procedures, and guidelines that are specific to Montenegro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While prior trainings relevant to the use of transparency methodologies, procedures, and guidelines have made an important impact in improving in-country technical expertise, their coverage could be significantly improved by involving more expert non-state organizations</li> <li>• Montenegro is a parliamentary democracy where gender equality is recognized in its legal and policy framework as one of the main principles, reified by the 2007 Constitution of Montenegro</li> </ul>	<p>veloped and approved by month 18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least two representatives from all key stakeholders agencies and organizations actively participated in the learning-by-doing workshops</li> <li>• At least 100 unique stakeholders participated in the learning-by-doing workshops</li> <li>• An equal balance of gender in the learning-by-doing workshops of Outputs 1.1 to 1.4 should be approximated by month 19</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <p>Strengthened national institutions to implement enhanced transparency</p>	<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> Number of tools and methodologies applied in the framework of the domestic MRV system to track NDC implementation</p> <p><b>Indicator 7:</b> Inter-ministerial and inter-directorate communication, coordination, and collaboration is strengthened</p> <p><b>Indicator 8:</b> Non-state public consultative mechanisms developed and integrated into official planning and decision-making processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GHG inventory and projections in both the FBUR and SBUR are based on methodologies from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.</li> <li>• The 2016 National Council for Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Integrated Coastal Zone Management serves as the mechanism to catalyze inter-ministerial and inter-directorate communication and cooperation, which is supported by the Working Group on Mitigation and Adaptation.</li> <li>• Montenegro is in the process of strengthening coordination processes to catalyze climate action. This includes the development of Methodology Procedure Guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New and updated models, tools, and methodologies for the GHG inventory and projects will be used to inform decision-making</li> <li>• The Working Group is convened at least four times per year, beginning in month 7, with broad-based stakeholder and expert representation</li> <li>• The National Council meets at least twice per year</li> <li>• Recommendations for institutional improvements are adopted within 6 months of being considered by the National Council and instituted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministerial briefing notes</li> <li>• Memoranda of agreements</li> <li>• Working group minutes</li> <li>• Project models, scenarios, and adaptation project concept proposals</li> <li>• Annual progress reports</li> <li>• Attendance lists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

		<p>of Modality Procedure Guidelines and the production of training material, method statements and regular outputs on indicators to monitor progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English proficiency is an important limitation to understand and adopt better approaches to combat climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>fter another 6 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 60 unique stakeholders participate in training workshops each year</li> <li>Project models, scenarios, and adaptation project concept proposals developed as part of the learning-by doing trainings are independently determined to be of high quality</li> <li>Annual independent assessments determine that technical inputs from the Working Group are informing planning and decision-making</li> <li>At least 90 percent of gender mainstreaming recommendations from the Working Group are adopted by month 42</li> <li>At least six (6) sets of English technical training courses with at least 30 stakeholders participating in each course</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 3</b></p> <p>Strengthened coordination and information exchange is institutionalized with an enhanced transparency framework</p>	<p><b>Indicator 9:</b> The MRV Portal is strengthened and institutionalized as a unifying consultative and coordinating mechanism</p> <p><b>Indicator 10:</b> Stakeholders are trained on best practice skills to use t</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Montenegro's MRV system is in its infancy, having supported the reporting on the national communications and two biennial update reports. However, Montenegro is pursuing a higher level of transparency that more approximates the European standards (EU 525/2013) and avoids conflicts between climate action (SDG 13) and other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 150 stakeholders (at least 40% women) are trained on data management skills relevant to the MRV portal</li> <li>The upgraded MRV portal is fully operational by month 42</li> <li>Feasible resource mobiliz</li> </ul>	•	•

	<p>he MRV portal for planning and decision-making on the global environment</p> <p><b>Indicator 11:</b> A long-term training programme is developed and institutionalized to use the MRV portal for planning decision-making</p> <p>-</p> <p><b>Indicator 12:</b> A sustainable financing strategy is developed for the national environmental information system</p>	<p>SDGs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data creation and management remains a major challenge for Montenegro</li> <li>• Systems for data and information management are outdated and inadequate</li> <li>• Decision-makers and government staff have limited technical skills</li> <li>• There is limited availability of funding</li> <li>• Existing government and private sector budgets to adopt cleaner energy and technologies and techniques to combat climate change are very limited</li> </ul>	<p>Resource Mobilization strategy finalized by month 39</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 90% of financial resources deemed necessary to ensure the long-term viability of the MRV portal and supporting institutional and technical capacities identified in the Resource Mobilization Strategy are independently deemed accessible by month 44 (at the time of the independent terminal evaluation)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 4</b></p> <p>A technical roadmap on low-carbon and climate-resilient development is formulated and adopted</p>	<p><b>Indicator 13:</b> Raised awareness of the contribution of global environmental values to socio-economic development</p> <p><b>Indicator 14:</b> Proactive management strategy and technical roadmap for the cost-effective and efficient pursuit of a low carbon economy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of best practices for combating climate change limited, and stakeholders do not fully appreciate the value of conserving the global environment.</li> <li>• English proficiency is an important limitation to understand and adopt better approaches to combat climate change.</li> <li>• A number of strategies and action plans have been recently developed to address important policy directions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pursue green development. However, many of these are sectoral, and there is a need to reconcile them as well as o</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roadmap drafted by month 38 and adopted by month 41</li> <li>• Three sets of private sector and media sensitization panel discussions held, one each year by the end of months 12, 24, and 36.</li> <li>• At least two (2) national and three (3) sub-national awareness workshops held, spread out in years 2, 3, and 4</li> <li>• At least 180 stakeholders will benefit from the English language courses by the end of the project.</li> </ul>	•	•

		rganize an over-arching cost-ette ctive approach to realistically the m without compromising their ind ividual legitimacy.	•		
--	--	---	---	--	--

[1] Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

[2] These will include a list of all workshop and working group participants

[3] Outcomes are short- to medium-term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

## **ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).**

n/a

## **ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.**

### **A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

no PPG funds were provided

## **ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

**Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)**

n/a

**ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet**

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Project Core Indicators		Expected at CEO Endorsement
1	<b>Terrestrial protected areas</b> created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Million Hectares)	0
2	<b>Marine protected areas</b> created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Million Hectares)	0
3	Area of <b>land restored</b> (Million Hectares)	0
4	Area of <b>landscapes under improved practices</b> (excluding protected areas)(Million Hectares)	0
5	Area of <b>marine habitat under improved practices</b> (excluding protected areas)(Million Hectares)	0
	Total area under improved management (Million Hectares)	0
6	<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated</b> (Million metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	0
7	<b>Number of shared water ecosystems</b> (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management	0
8	Globally over-exploited <b>marine fisheries</b> moved to more sustainable levels (thousand metric tons)( Percent of fisheries, by volume)	0
9	<b>Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination</b> and avoidance of <b>chemicals of global concern</b> and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (thousand metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)	0
10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of <b>POPs to air</b> from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)	0
11	Number of <b>direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender</b> as co-benefit of GEF investment	210 men 210 women

**ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet**

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

## ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)											Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1		Component 2		Component 3		Component 4		Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		{Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency}[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 1.2	Sub-component 2.1	Sub-component 2.2	Sub-component 3.1	Sub-component 3.2	Sub-component 4.1	Sub-component 4.2					
Goods	Procurement of information communication technology necessary to set up and operate the MRV Portal					61,000				61,000			61,000	MSDT
Contractual Services – Individual	Project Manager and Finance /Admin Assistant									-		91,000	91,000	MSDT
Contractual Services – Company	Three workshops for each of outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 for a total of twelve (12) workshops	60,000								60,000			60,000	MSDT
Contractual Services – Company	Sub contracting of company(ies) to organize learning by doing workshops			128,000						128,000			128,000	MSDT
Contractual Services – Company	Sub contract for organizing and servicing learning by doing workshops					61,000				61,000	5,000		66,000	MSDT
Contractual Services – Company	Workshop venue costs							15,000		15,000			15,000	MSDT
Local Consultants	Preparation of materials and workshop facilitation by consultants	193,000								193,000			193,000	MSDT
Local Consultants	Preparation of materials and workshop facilitation by consultants			171,000						171,000			171,000	MSDT
Local Consultants	Preparation of materials and workshop facilitation by consultants					146,500				146,500			146,500	MSDT
Local Consultants	Preparation of materials and workshop facilitation by consultants							61,000		61,000	3,000		64,000	MSDT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Meeting costs to negotiate memoranda of agreement(s)	2,000								2,000			2,000	MSDT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Bilateral and small focus group meetings			6,000						6,000			6,000	MSDT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Bilateral consultations, focus group meetings, and workshops					6,500				6,500			6,500	MSDT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Bilateral and small focus group meetings							5,000		5,000			5,000	MSDT
Travel	Travel for 6 individuals per year for 4 years or a total of 24 international travel budgeted at US\$ 1,500 each. Additional travel budget for 2 training of the trainers budgeted at US\$ 2,500 each					41,000				41,000			41,000	MSDT
Travel	Travel for 6 individuals per year for 4 years or a total of 24 international travel budgeted at US\$ 1,500 each.							36,000		36,000			36,000	MSDT
Other Operating Costs	Audit									-		8,000	8,000	MSDT
Grand Total		255,000		305,000		316,000		117,000		993,000	8,000	99,000	1,100,000	