



Enabling the Kingdom of Bhutan to prepare its Fourth National Communication (4NC) and First and Second Biennial Transparency Report (BTR1-2) to the UNFCCC

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11480

Countries

Bhutan

Project Name

Enabling the Kingdom of Bhutan to prepare its Fourth National Communication (4NC) and First and Second Biennial Transparency Report (BTR1-2) to the UNFCCC

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/23/2023

Review completed by PM

11/1/2023

Program Manager

Toshiyuki Yamasaki

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 12/21/2023:
Thank you. Cleared.

Toshi 11/9/2023:

This project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal area strategy. However, the following information is missing in the General Enabling Activity Information table:
- "Type of Report(s)". Please add the following type of reports: UNFCCC Biennial Transparency Report/National Communication (BTR/NC) and UNFCCC Biennial Transparency Report (BTR)
- "Expected Report Submission to Convention". Please add the expected submission date for the combined BTR/NC and BTR respectively.

Agency's Comments

RE 11/9:

Thank you ? the report types and submission dates have been updated in the Portal.

Cost Ranges.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:

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

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 1/25/2024:

Thank you. Cleared.

Toshi 12/21/2023:

Thank you, most of comments (except for Stakeholder) were addressed.
Please address the following remaining comment.

Stakeholders:

- 1) Please highlight the part of your modifications.
- 2) Information on stakeholder engagements is still inadequate. Please consider adding a list of stakeholders with each of their role and engagement.

Toshi 11/9/2023:

- 1) The proposal says, "including more up-to-date inventories of emission sources and sinks using advanced IPCC guidance and information necessary to track progress?", please clarify if the project will use the 2019 IPCC guideline refinement.
- 2) Adaptation Communication: In line with Decision 9/CMA.1, Parties may submit an adaptation communication as a component of, or in conjunction with, a BTR. Please clarify if the country intends to submit its Adaptation Communication as a component or in conjunction with its BTR1/NC4.
- 3) Stakeholders: The project very briefly references stakeholders' engagement of a wide range of sectors, including line ministries and agencies, local communities, local authorities and NGOs. While component 1 outcome states "Enhanced coordination for BTR preparation, the project does not elaborate in the project document or the stakeholder matrix any details on how to achieve this outcome or consultations and roles of local communities, local authorities and NGOs. Please provide further details in this regard.
- 4) Gender: Please integrate gender perspectives in Outputs: 1.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.4.1, and report on gender dimensions of the project in M&E.
- 5) In P.6 and 7, the abbreviation FTC may cause confusion because the first time FTC appeared in Outcome 2.4, it is "financial, technology development and transfer and capacity building support (FTC)", on the other hand, the second time it appeared in Output 2.4.1, it is "financial,

technology development and transfer" , and capacity building support needed and received (FTC)?, like this, the place of the acronym is different.

Please unify it (I can infer it stands for **F**inancial, **T**echnology

Development and **C**apacity Building).

Since "financial, technology development and transfer, and capacity building" appears only twice, isn't it necessary to abbreviate?

- 6) Regarding abbreviation words, to avoid confusion, please explain them when they appeared for the first time, i.e., PSC (it is explained in Section E of P.10, but it appears in Section D of P.10 for the first time), and check it through the proposal again.

Agency's Comments

RE 12/21:

Thank you for your feedback.

1. All changes are tracked and highlighted.
2. The section relative to the stakeholder's engagement has been revised. Specific roles and responsibilities of the main stakeholders are summarized in a table and a revised document has also been uploaded accordingly.

RE 11/9:

1. Specific information on the type of IPCC GLs that will be used for the GHG inventory has been included as well as in the logical framework.
2. The project will support activities and compilation of climate change impacts and adaptation chapter, as outlined under the Adaptation section. However, the Party does not intend to submit an Adaptation Communication as a component of, or in conjunction with the proposed BTR1 and BTR2/NC4
3. The narrative is modified to highlight the importance of ensuring collaboration with the national CBIT project.

Furthermore, a specific activity has been added to the work plan under Output 1.1.1 "Organize individual meetings, if necessary, with sector representatives to integrate information about local communities, local authorities, NGOs, research institutions, private sector and international organizations".

4. Noted. Implemented in the logical framework as per the suggestion.

5. Noted and updated accordingly.
6. Noted and updated accordingly.

NEW OUTPUT added under Outcome 2.5 regarding the review and FMCP in the Logical Framework as well as new activities included in the work plan for this output: Please note that a new output has been added under Outcome 2.5. Output 2.5.3 refers specifically to the review and the FMCP processes that follow the BTR submission to the UNFCCC. Although briefly mentioned, there were no specific actions for review and FMCP which are core elements of the ETF (as per the Paris Agreement, most chapters of the BTRs will be reviewed through a TER process, except for the adaptation chapters) and ensure the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement. In addition, this output justifies extending the project beyond the BTR submission date, as indicated in the work plan. Finally, skills for the review process were already considered in the TORs of national experts. This new output does not imply additional costs for project implementation.

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:
Yes.

Agency's Comments

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:
Yes, institutional arrangements, including the narrative description of the project activities are well elaborated.

Agency's Comments

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Yes. The M&E budget for the project is \$63,150.

Agency's Comments

Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Yes. This is in line with Information Note

GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency's Comments

Rio Markers.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 12/21/2023:

Thank you. Cleared.

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Please correct the Rio Markers to Principal Objective 2 for CC Mitigation, Significant Objective 1 for CC Adaptation, No Contribution 0 for Biodiversity and Desertification, as shown in the screenshot below:

G. Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation	Climate Change Adaptation	Biodiversity	Desertification
Principal Objective 2	Significant Objective 1	No Contribution 0	No Contribution 0

Agency's Comments

RE 11/9:

The correction to the CCA to SO1 has been made in the Portal.

Country endorsement.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 1/25/2024:

Thank you. Cleared.

Toshi 12/21/2023:

I have confirmed that the new LOE has been uploaded, but the link in Section 3-H is still to the old LOE, so please correct the link as well.

Toshi 11/9/2023:

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

However, the Letter of Endorsement stipulates that the sources of funds come from the Climate Change. This should say ?CC Set Aside? ? an email from the OFP specifying this will suffice (please append the email to the documents tab).

The total financing (from GEFTF) being requested for this project is US\$1,350,135, inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for Bhutan is detailed in the table below:

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFTF	FAO	Climate Change	1,233,000	117,135	0	0	1,350,135
Total GEF Resources			1,233,000	117,135	0	0	1,350,135

Thanking you,

Sincerely



Thinlay Yandon (Ms.)

GEF Operational Focal Point/ Offg. Director



F: GEF Financing Resources Requested by Agency, Country and Programming of Funds

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	GEF Enabling Activity Financing (\$)	Agency (\$)
FAO	GET	Bhutan	Climate Change	CC Set-Aside	1,233,000.00	117,13
Total GEF Resources					1,233,000.00	117,13

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation:

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds
Total GEF Resources(\$)				

Agency's Comments

RE 12/21:

The LoE has been uploaded in Section 3-H.

RE: 11/9:

The revised LoE has been uploaded.

Response to Comments

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

Gef Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
Council comments

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
STAP comments

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
CSOs comments

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
Project Budget Table.

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

Secretariat's Comments
Toshi 12/21/2023:
Thank you. Cleared.

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Project's staff (project coordinator + administrative and financial assistant) amounts for \$327,840, which is nearly 30% of the EA budget, it seems little bit high, please revise it to reduce the amount of staff cost as much as possible.

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3 (M&E)	PMC	Total GEF	DoECC	FAO Support Services
				Total	Total	Total				
5013 Consultants										
International ETF experts	Month	25	6,000	15,000	135,000	0		150,000		150,000
Sub-total international Consultants				15,000	135,000			150,000		150,000
National ETF experts	Month	185	3,150	58,275	524,475	0		582,750	582,750	
Project Coordinator	Month	48	4,500	21,600	172,800	21,600		216,000	216,000	
Administrative and financial assistant	Month	48	2,330				111,840	111,840	111,840	
Sub-total national Consultants				79,875	697,275	21,600	111,840	910,590	910,590	-
5013 Sub-total consultants				94,875	832,275	21,600	111,840	1,060,590	910,590	150,000
5650 Contracts										
Reports layout design	Lumpsum	2	4,930	0	9,860	0		9,860	9,860	
Workshop inception	Lumpsum	1	8,000	8,000	0	0		8,000	8,000	
Consultation/advancement workshop	Lumpsum	2	8,000	8,000	8,000	0		16,000	16,000	
Workshop validation for BTR and BTR2/NC	Lumpsum	2	8,000	0	16,000	0		16,000	16,000	
Final evaluation	Lumpsum	1	35,000	0	0	35,000		35,000		35,000
Terminal report	Lumpsum	1	6,550	0	0	6,550		6,550		6,550
5650 Sub-total Contracts				16,000	33,860	41,550	0	91,410	49,860	41,550
5021 Travel										
International travel	Lumpsum	8	6,000	0	48,000	0		48,000	14,400	33,600
Domestic travel	Lumpsum	8	1,000	0	8,000	0		8,000	8,000	
5021 Sub-total travel				0	56,000	0	0	56,000	22,400	33,600
5023 Training										
Ad-hoc capacity building sessions on ETF matters (including CTF and CRT tables)	Lumpsum	5	5,000	12,500	12,500			25,000	25,000	
5023 Sub-total training				12,500	12,500	0	0	25,000	25,000	
TOTAL				123,375	934,635	63,150	111,840	1,233,000	1,007,850	225,150

Agency's Comments

RE 11/9:

The budget unit cost has been modified for Project Coordinator and administrative assistant and increased months for national technical experts. In this way the project's staff amounts to about 17% (i.e. 210,000\$).

Environmental and Social Safeguards.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/9/2023:

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

Agency's Comments

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 12/21/2023:

Please address the remaining comments above (Enabling Activity Summary and LOE).

Toshi 11/9/2023:

Please address the comments above.

REVIEW DATE(S)

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	11/9/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		