# Suriname?s First and Second Biennial Transparency Reports under the PA and the Fourth National Communication to the UNFCCC (BTR1/NC4/BTR2)

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**
12367
**Countries**
Suriname
**Project Name**
Suriname?s First and Second Biennial Transparency Reports under the PA and the Fourth National Communication to the UNFCCC (BTR1/NC4/BTR2)
**Agencies**
UNDP
**Date received by PM**
6/8/2026
**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**
Milena Vasquez
**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

MGV, 6/8/2026: Please clarify why the expected submission dates for the reports. The table and summary state the first BTR is expected to be submitted by December 2027, while in the description of the EA Outputs, 1.1.5 says December 2026. Please also clarify if December 2027 is the expected date, why is the second BTR only one year later (December 2028), considering that BTRs are meant to be biennial.

Further, NCs are usually communicated every 4 years. As Suriname is a SIDS, their submission is at the country's discretion. It would be useful to understand the thinking behind it and ensure that the expected communication dates would be achievable. Furthermore, ideally there would be a TER process for its first BTR, so the country can apply findings to the next BTR.

MGV, 6/8/2026: The above comment has been clarified with changes to the submission dates.

### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response 10 June 2026

Expected submission dates are corrected. BTR1 is December 2027 and BTR2 is December 2029.

For the 4NC do note that this is a priority from the government. As Suriname is transitioning into an oil gas based extractive economy, NC4 provides the country with baselines and also opportunity for leverage carbon credits. A TER process for the BTR1 is planned and expected. The dates are consulted with the counterparts and they are achievable.

**Cost Ranges.**

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

### Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 6/8/2026: N/A

### 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

MGV, 6/8/2026: While Suriname as a SIDS has flexibility, please comment on the plan to prepare the inventory report under the first BTR up to 2023, rather than 2024 as latest reporting year should be no more than 2 years prior to the submission year. Further, if submission of the first BTR is actually expected for December 2027, then the inventory should at least go up to 2024 to meet T-3.

MGV, 6/8/2026: The above comment has been clarified with changes to the submission dates.

Agency's Comments
UNDP Response - 10 June 2026

Thank you for this comment. The plan to prepare the inventory report under the first BTR is corrected up to 2024.

**Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information**

**Eligibility Criteria.**

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

**Secretariat's Comments**MGV, 6/8/2026: Yes.

**Agency's Comments**

**Institutional framework.**

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

Secretariat's Comments
MGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

MGV, 6/12/2026: Please address the below comments:

1. Agency executing role: Thank you for the documentation related to the Agency request for a dual role exception waiver. **Please clarify in the review sheet which institution performed the PCAT on the Ministry of Oil, Gas and Environment.**
2. Please note that there are inconsistences between the dual role exception waiver request and the description of the EA institutional arrangements. For example, the Executing Partner is listed as being responsible for ?*Procurement of goods and services, including human resources*? yet in the submitted Agency justification for dual role waiver, it is explained that the Agency will lead ?*Recruitment and contracting of project management unit personnel*;? and ?*Procurement of goods and services, including consultancy services*.? The same paragraph describes OGM as responsible for ?*Financial management, including overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets*? but that is also at odds with the dual role request. **Please correct such inconsistencies in this section when resubmitting the EA.**
3. **Please revise or supplement the following statement so that it reflects the CEO?s letter to Agency coordinators dated 19 March 2026 regarding the role of Agency representatives participating in but not a voting authority in PSCs:** ?*In case consensus cannot be reached within the Board, the UNDP representative on the board will mediate to find consensus and, if this cannot be found, will take the*

*final decision to ensure project implementation is not unduly delayed*.? (There is alternate standard language from the Agency which has been previously discussed and cleared by the Secretariat.)

4. **Please revise the following statement (p. 18) to remove the bracketed text which references GEF approval of the dual role exception waiver request:** ?*The Executing Entity and GEF OFP have requested UNDP to provide support services for the full duration of the project, [and the GEF has agreed for UNDP to provide such execution support services] on condition that such costs*?? While the GEF Manager has issued a no-objection for the Agency to include a request for dual role exception waiver, only the GEF Council or CEO are authorized to approve projects, inclusive of the final implementation and execution modalities.

MGV, 6/17/2026: Additional details have been provided.

Agency's Comments

1. As per PCAT form instructions, the Project developer with information from the HACT performed the PCAT.

**Responsibility and Timing:** The PCAT should be completed by the Project Developer as soon as possible during the Project Design phase, with HACT Micro-Assessment inputs from the Third-Party Service Provider where required. The PCAT generates a summary of the results of the Partner capacity assessments that can be attached to the Project Document, eliminating the need to write long-form/narrative reports on capacity assessment results.

2. Institutional arrangements are fixed in the EA request. Inconsistencies are corrected.

3. The statement is correct/reviewed.

4. The statement is reviewed.

**Monitoring and Evaluation.**

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments

**Section 3. Information Tables**

**GEF resource availability.**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**MGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: N/A

Agency's Comments
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: N/A

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: N/A

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: N/A

Agency's Comments
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: Yes.

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments
**Country endorsement.**

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments
**Response to Comments**

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**Council comments**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**STAP comments**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
**Project Budget Table.**

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

Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

MGV, 6/12/2026: Please address the below comments:

1. The Budget Table lists OGM as the entity responsible for all listed expenditures (far right column) save for the audit costs. However, this is inconsistent with the Agency request for dual role exception waiver. **Please revise this column so that OGM is listed only for expenditures for which the Executing Partner will expend GEF funding received from the Agency.**

2. **Please revise the budget lines under Contractual Services ? Individual and Local and International Consultants so that each discrete role appears on its own budget line.** As currently presented, multiple project personnel roles are combined in a single line, making a value-for-money analysis very difficult.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contractual services-Individual | Contractual services individuals $109,975 5 sectorial NPSA 1. Energy, 2) Industrial Production & Other Product Use (IPPU), 3) Agriculture, 4) Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF)) and 5) Waste) ($21,995 per year each distributed in 3 years) | 109,975 | | 109,975 | | | 109,975 | OGM |
| Contractual services-Individual | Total $88,430 Project Manager salaries for 4 years (non technical tasks = $36,430 Project assistant ($1,000*52 months) = $52,000 | | | - | | 88,430 | 88,430 | OGM |
| International Consultants | International consultants (USD92,980) 4 International consultant ( data collection, elaboration, trend scenarios and NDC and adaptation component) Rate per year each = $23,245 distributed in 2 years) | | 92,980 | 92,980 | | | 92,980 | OGM |
| International Consultants | Total: $157,976 2 International consultant for the coordination of the elaboration of the NGHGI and NDC tracking ( rate per month 6,582.33 * 24 months). | 157,976 | | 157,976 | | | 157,976 | OGM |

3. The budget proposes total expenditures on personnel equivalent to 72% of the GEF funding. Even for an EA, which is personnel intensive, this is a very high proportion; the target share for GEF portfolio projects is 30%. **Please review the budget for potential cost savings and remove redundant or overlapping roles. In the resubmission, please indicate to which non-personnel budget lines the savings have been reallocated.** As one example, the budget calls for over a dozen consultants or contractors, and yet the Project Manager is still budgeted against the project component budget without strong justification rooted in the outputs of the project.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contractual services-Individual | Contractual services - Individuals (USD $133,500.00) Partial Project coordinator's salary = $33,375 for 4 years. (PM technical tasks such as coordinate and analyze the technical quality of the products. Assuring the documents and databases comply with requirements related to reporting and review in BTR, provide technical assistance to OGM in the identification, review technical reports and substantively contribute to development of technical knowledge products and other deliverables obtained from consultants and contractors. (monthly 2,781.25) | | 133,500 | 133,500 | | | 133,500 | OGM |

4. **Please revise the lines for printing/AV costs, which as presented appear potentially duplicative:**

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other Operating Costs | Audio Visual & Print Products Costs (USD 34,000) | 34,000 | | 34,000 | | | 34,000 | OGM |
| Other Operating Costs | Audio Visual & Print Products Costs (USD 35,000) Costs related to 4NC/2BTR report design, printing and publications, translations, and/or dissemination materials for a total cost of USD $ 35,000. | | 35,000 | 35,000 | | | 35,000 | OGM |

MGV, 6/18/2026: Thank you for the changes to the project documentation. However, the justification provided for such a large share of GEF funding for project personnel is not sufficient ? there are many examples of recently approved BTR EAs in the GEF portfolio where such expenditures fall within the 30%-50% range, including in SIDS and LDCs.

Please review the budget for cost savings. Please note that if the Project Manager is to be charged against project components and not just PMC, there should be a corresponding reduction in consultants, as the provided TOR for the PM is vague, lacks description of leading any technical delivery, and is concerned mostly with activities eligible for cost recovery under PMC or the Agency fee.

When revising the budget, please indicate to which non-personnel budget lines the savings have been reallocated.

6/18/2026: additional information has been provided to justify budget allocations.

Agency's Comments

1. UNDP will be responsible for contractual services and it is reflected in the budget now. Please note that for the remaining lines, UNDP does not execute these activities, but rather only releases the funds as direct payment to the suppliers/vendors on behalf of OGM who executes the activity. For this reason, the IP name is to be kept in that column.
2. Budget lines reviewed and separated.
3. Considering existing institutional capacity constraints and the consequent need for a high level of technical assistance to meet UNFCCC reporting timelines, the proportion of personnel costs reflects the nature of the project as an Enabling Activity (EA) and the national context in which it is implemented. The achievement of the project outcomes, including the timely preparation and submission of the BTRs and National Communications (NCs), requires the availability of specialized technical capacities across multiple thematic areas, which are primarily provided through the proposed individual consultants and contractual personnel. In this context and taking into account the established timelines for submission of reports to the UNFCCC, the use of targeted consultancies is considered an appropriate and efficient approach to ensure technical quality, coordination, and the timely achievement of the project?s expected results. The PM partial salary is in the component 1 for the technical and specific tasks that are needed already identified by OGM and in the TOR
4. They are not duplicate. One is for the BTR1 and the other is for the BTR2/NC. It is clearer now in the budget.

June 18 2026: Please note that for Suriname national context, the specialized technical capacities needed are mainly available through individual consultants and contractual personnel, and no companies in the country can provide the required technical services. As such, within the current budget, it is not possible to remove roles that are important for the BTR report preparation and instead allocate the funds for the remaining budget lines. All changes to the budget must be consulted with the Government IP. We further note that there are no Council approved policies or rules on any specific target share for personnel and consultants within the GEF BTR EA portfolio, and there is precedent of recent UNDP proposals in Latin America approved for GEF8 with budgeted personnel equivalent to over 70% of the GEF funding. Finally, it is important to highlight the urgency to prioritize BTR submission to meet UNFCCC reporting timelines. The TOR for the PM were revised and the technical work to be delivered under project component has been strengthened. Please note that as per Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy, particularly the ?Activities Covered by the Agency Fee?, none of the activities planned for the PM are related to that list.

**Environmental and Social Safeguards.**

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

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 6/8/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

## Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 6/8/2026: Not yet. Please address comments provided.

MGV, 6/8/2026: Technical comments have been addressed.

MGV, 6/12/2026: Please address comments on institutional arrangements and budget.

MGV, 6/18/2026: Please address remaining comments on the budget.

6/18/2026: comments have been sufficiently addressed. PM recommends clearance.

**REVIEW DATE(S)**

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| **First Review** | **6/8/2026** | **6/10/2026** |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **6/10/2026** | **6/16/2026** |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **6/12/2026** | **6/18/2026** |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **6/18/2026** | |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **6/18/2026** | |