

Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Philippines to Comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11950
Countries
Philippines
Project Name
Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Philippines to Comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement
Agencies
CI
Date received by PM
6/4/2025
Review completed by PM
7/29/2025
Program Manager
Saba Kalam
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. We recommend to reconsider if the CCA Rio Marker should be Significant Objective (1) instead of No Contribution (0). Kindly address.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Upon consideration, we added CCA Rio Marker to be Significant Objective (1) instead of No Contribution (0).

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, cleared

1. It will be helpful to elaborate what does "ensuring compliance with global standards" mean, which global standards?

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

1. Global standards pertain to the standards set in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement.

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- 1. May require a small correction in paragraph 1.1.4 which says "Article 13 provides a Global Stocktake Process (GSP)". Whereas Article 14 provides the GST process and the ETF in Article 13 "informs" the GST process.
- 2. Kindly explain how the project will collaborate and complement the work done by the enabling activity project GEF ID 11665, implemented by FAO, for the preparation the combined Third National Communication (BTR2/NC3) and Third Biennial Transparency Report (BTR3).

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

1. Replaced the following...

"Article 13 provides a Global Stocktake Process (GSP) to assess the collective progress every five (5) years and informs Parties to update and enhance their actions towards achieving the purpose of the Paris Agreement.

...with:

"Article 14 of the Paris Agreement provides for the Global Stocktake (GST) to assess the collective progress of all Parties every five (5) years toward achieving the long-term goals of the Agreement. This process is informed by the transparency reports submitted by countries under Article 13, which establishes the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF). The ETF ensures that countries track and report their climate actions in a transparent, accurate, and comparable manner."

2. Inserted as item 1.1.7. on page 3:

"The proposed CBIT project will build on and complement the achievements of the GEF Enabling Activity project (GEF ID 11665) implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which supported the Government of the Philippines in the preparation of its Third National Communication (NC3), Biennial Transparency Report 2 (BTR2), and Biennial Transparency Report 3 (BTR3). That enabling activity strengthened the institutional foundations for climate reporting, enhanced national GHG inventories, and improved sectoral data integration across AFOLU, IPPU, and energy sectors. By engaging many of the same technical experts and national agencies, the CBIT project will ensure continuity and synergy. It will go further by

institutionalizing the processes initiated under the enabling activity, establishing sectoral hubs, creating digital MRV systems, and operationalizing coordination mechanisms that extend beyond single-report cycles. Opportunities for co-location and staff coordination will be explored with FAO, CCC, and line agencies to maximize technical knowledge and avoid duplication. Lessons from the enabling activity will be incorporated into the development of standardized tools and protocols under the ETF, ensuring that BTR2 and BTR3 efforts are transitioned into sustainable national systems.?

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks are properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Following on our previous comment, please ensure there is strong coordination and complementarity between the CBIT project and the EA project GEF ID 11655 throughout the project components.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Inserted as item 1.1.7. on page 3, as mentioned above.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/18/2025

There are formatting issues in the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view. Please review the entire document

The implementation of the NDC is guided by the Nationally Determined Contribution Implementation Plan (NDCIP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP), which outlines gender-responsive and specific policies and measures (PAMs) across key sectors: agriculture, waste management, industry, transportation, and energy. Aligned with these, the Philippine government adopted the Nation Adaptation Plan (NAP) 2023-2050, which aims to 'steadily reduce climate-related loss and damage and build the country adaptive capacity towards transformative resilience and sustainable economic development by 2050.' The Philippines' NAP identified four Climatic Impact-Drivers (CIDs) deemed most critical to the Philippines' vulnerability. These are (1) Increase temperature and drought; (2) Sea level rise and extreme sea levels; (3) Extreme precipitation; and, (4) Extreme winds and Tropical cyclones. The Philippine NAP outlines eight sectoral outcomes, including sets of priority outcomes and strategies, to strengthen resilience, reduce climate-related losses and damages, and enhance the adaptive capacity of communities for sustainable socio-economic development. These include: 1) Agriculture and Fisheries and Food Security; 2) Water Resources; 3) Health; 4) Ecosystems and Biodiversity; 5) Cultural Heritage, Population Displacement and Migration; 6) Land Use and Human Settlements; 7) Livelihoods and Industries; and 8) Energy, Transport and Communications.

Figure 1. Philippine Institutional Arrangements for Transparency Reporting

Agency Response

CI-GEF October 06, 2025

The text (highlighted in turquoise) has been adjusted to have a better portal view. The entire document has been reviewed as requested and no other formatting issue was identified.

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, but please see comment in section 8.9

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted and action taken relative to the comment in 8.9.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable

Agency Response
6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is cleared. Aligned with CCM Objective 2

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes, it is aligned with implementation of the Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable

Agency Response
7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, Policy section has been completed outlining gender engagement. Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, Gender Mainstreaming Plan uploaded. Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, Stakeholder Engagement Plan uploaded. Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The total budget in the table (portal) is not matching with the figures in the attached budget sheet. Please correct.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

The revised budget sheet has been uploaded.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This is cleared. CBIT-Set Aside.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNot Applicable.

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNot Applicable.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNot Applicable.

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThis is cleared.

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, status of utilization of project preparation grant (PPG) is provided. This is cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, it matches with OFP's LoE. This is cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Please remove Department of Agriculture and Philippine Statistics Authority from the co-financing table as no confirmed letter of co-financing are submitted for these sources. Additionally, the co-financing table is incomplete with the amount for these two.
2. Please submit confirmed letter of co-financing for Conservation International and Climate Change Commission. The letters are missing in the portal.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

1. The two agencies have been removed.
2. The confirmed co-financing of CI and CCC have been uploaded.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project has been endorsed by the OFP Ms. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh (OFP since 05/04/2009). This is cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Yes, Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The LOE is missing the footnote subject the designated executing entity to the capacity assessment by CI. Please obtain an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing to such condition, or a revised LOE with such added footnote.

Agency Response

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

A revised Letter of Endorsement has been secured which now included a footnote. This is also uploaded in the portal.

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNot Applicable

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, this is cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

Clearance noted.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. In Annex E on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic coordinates of the sites (capitol of country) directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

Agency Response
CI-GEF July 24, 2025

The geolocation information requested has been added.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Yes uploaded.
 1. We note that CI attached ESS screening documents, gender action plan, grievance addressed mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement plan. The project is classified as Low risk. However, page 24 of the Second screening form said ?moderate? risk considering climate risks and gender-based violence.
 - ? Please make these ESS risk consistent with the screening document and provide clear mitigation measures to address these risks.
 - ? Please revise the environmental and social risk section of the Key Risks table in the Portal based on the second screening document.

08/04/2025

1. **Environmental and Social Safeguards : Please make these ESS risk consistent with the screening document, in the 'Overall project/program risk classification' in the project document is still 'low' while the ESS screening document is moderate.**

Agency Response
CI-GEF August 14, 2025

There was a misunderstanding when addressing this comment in the previous round. The ESS Screening Form (on page 23 of the Form) is dedicated to the identification of risks related to ESS8 on Community Health, Safety, and Security. This section was completed by the EA team and portrays contextual risks associated with ESS8. The information provided in the ESS Screening Form was then analyzed by the CI-GEF Agency ESMF team, who based on the information provided and considering the project activities, determines which ESS standards would be triggered and the mitigation measures required. In the case of this project, ESS8 was not triggered, as although there are contextual risks to Community Health, Safety, and Security, such as the presence of GBV and the likelihood of natural disasters in the Philippines, the risks to project activities (focused on capacity building and strengthening of mainly government staff and institutions) are Low. Also, the ESS Screening Report considers all the ESS Standards and risks and provides an overall risk rating, which is Low (Category C) for this project.

Further, the risk of GBV is addressed through the AGM document, which has a special section dedicated to GBV and SEAH-related grievances. As for climate risks, the mitigation measures are described between pages 32 and 33 of the ESS Screening Form.

We have reversed the changes made during the last round of review to correct the misunderstanding from our end, and provided the explanation above as to clarify any misinterpretation of the information contained in the ESS Screening Form. The ProDoc remains a Category C rating (i.e. low ESS risks), as was originally assigned to this project. We have also modified the ESS Screening Form on page 23 to better reflect the ESS8 risk ratings when applied to the planned project activities.

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

-The ESS risk rating has been updated and clear mitigation measures are included in the section.

-The environmental and social risk category in the Key Risk table in the Portal has been updated.

- ESS risk was ensured consistent and a clear mitigation measure has been provided.
- The ESS risk section of the Key Risk table in the Portal has been revised.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/13/2025

The two roles (project lead and project coordinator) has lot of overlapping functions. In such projects, the project lead is expected to undertake the coordination function and act an interface between the two departments/ministries. This will help to enhance the effectiveness and also ensure resource efficiency. It is recommended to retain one position (i.e Project Lead) and remove the coordinator position.

-
-
1. A Project Lead and a Liaison Officer are being charged to project components and PMC. Administrative and managerial positions should usually be charged 100% to PMC. Please revise the budget as appropriate or provide TOR with clear deliverables for both technical and managerial/administrative tasks to justify budget allocation.
 2. Staff and consultant costs accounts for 38% of the project budget, which is relatively high. Please consider revising the budget down.

08/04/2025

1. We take note of the agency's comment on the Liaison Officer not being charged to PMC. However, this position is listed as a staff. The TORs will allow us to assess there is no overlapping of functions with the Project Lead.

2. We appreciate the agency's efforts to reduce the costs of staff and consultants. However, at 34% these continue to be relatively high. Please consider revising these budget lines down. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

3. The budget table is difficult to read in the PDF document (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted) refer to pages 79-80.

08/15/2025

-We could not find the TORs for the Liaison Officer that will allow us to assess there is no overlapping of functions with the Project Lead. Please upload the ToR for the Liaison Officer.

- - We appreciate the agency's efforts to reduce the costs of staff and consultants. However, at 30% these continue to be above the recommended threshold of 25%. Please consider revising these budget lines down. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

08/27/2025

1. We appreciate the inclusion of the TORs for the Liaison Officer and the Project Lead. We noted that more than 50% of the Liaison Officer tasks overlap with tasks of the Project Lead. Which poses the question, why does a Project Lead require an officer for execution of some of the tasks? We find this position unnecessary.

Project Lead

Report to the Head of Klima Center

Coordinate with CI-GEF, the PSC, EA, TAG, and other partners and stakeholders throughout the course of the project

Liaison Officer

Report to the Head of Klima Center and the Project Manager/Lead of the CBIT Philippines Project

Coordinate with the PSC, EA, TAG, and other partners and stakeholders throughout the course of the project

Facilitate collaboration among government agencies, private sector partners, civil society organizations, and technical working groups to ensure effective data-sharing, alignment with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), and inclusive participation

Perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Head of Klima Center, CI-GEF, and CCC, similar to and related to the functions enumerated above

Ensure the quality of project activities and outputs through regular monitoring and evaluation

Engage in policy dialogue and advocacy to promote the project and its findings

Assist in facilitating collaboration among government agencies, private sector partners, civil society organizations, and technical working groups to ensure effective data-sharing, alignment with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), and inclusive participation

Perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Head of Klima Center, the Project Manager/Lead, and the EA.

Together with the Project Manager/Lead and M&E and Safeguards Officer, ensure the quality of project activities and outputs through regular monitoring and evaluation

Engage in policy dialogue and advocacy to promote the project and its findings

2. The new budget table is off the margins in the CEO Approval Request PDF (which is the document that is circulated to the Council and later web posted - see pages 78-79 in the attached pdf file). We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

ProDoc (CEO Endorsement) Budget Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (\$USeq)							Total (\$USeq)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1		Component 2		Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 3.1					
Personnel and Professional Services	Staff - Project Lead	18,792	18,792	18,792	25,813	84,989	-	31,434	116,421	Manila Observer
	Staff - M&E and Safeguards Officer	7,091	7,091	12,347	12,347	38,876	25,785	-	64,661	Manila Observer
	Staff - Finance & Admin Specialist	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,791	44,791	Manila Observer
	Staff - Technical Specialist	9,900	9,900	19,800	19,800	59,400	-	-	59,400	Manila Observer
	Staff - Liaison Officer	4,356	4,356	8,712	8,712	26,136	-	-	26,136	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Capacity Needs Assessment and Training Program Development	3,148	-	-	-	3,148	-	-	3,148	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Capacity Building on Technology Use and Data Integration	9,287	-	-	-	9,287	-	-	9,287	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Communication and Data Protocol	-	6,192	-	-	6,192	-	-	6,192	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Stakeholder Engagement and Policy Integration Plan for Data Sharing Platform	-	8,983	-	-	8,983	-	-	8,983	Manila Observer
	Consultant - National Capacity Assessment on GHG Data Collection and MRV	-	-	9,287	-	9,287	-	-	9,287	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Standardized Sectoral MRV Protocols and Emission Factors	-	-	5,912	-	5,912	-	-	5,912	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Gender-Sensitive Technical Guides and Reporting Frameworks	-	-	5,912	-	5,912	-	-	5,912	Manila Observer
	Consultant /Facilitator - Comprehensive Training Program on MRV and GHG Data Collection	-	-	4,329	-	4,329	-	-	4,329	Manila Observer
	Consultant - Learning and Support Mechanisms	-	-	5,912	-	5,912	-	-	5,912	Manila Observer
	Consultant - K&M Comprehensive Gender Responsive and Inclusive Policy Brief and Fact Sheets	-	-	-	4,490	4,490	-	-	4,490	Manila Observer
Consultant - Digital and Online Knowledge-Sharing Platforms	-	-	-	8,250	8,250	-	-	8,250	Manila Observer	
International Consultant - Project Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	8,000	CI	
Consultant - Annual financial audit	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,690	12,690	Manila Observer	
Travel, Meetings and Workshops	Meeting - Multi-Stakeholder Consultation for the Establishment of Sectoral GHG Working Groups	6,370	-	-	-	6,370	-	-	6,370	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Institutional Strengthening and Technical Capacity Building for GHG Data Management	26,077	-	-	-	26,077	-	-	26,077	Manila Observer
	Meeting - Operational Coordination Meetings of Sectoral GHG Working Groups	37,191	-	-	-	37,191	-	-	37,191	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Hands-On Training on MRV Equipment Use and Integration	22,777	-	-	-	22,777	-	-	22,777	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Integration of Sectoral Data with NCCOIES and the National GHG Inventories	4,587	-	-	-	4,587	-	-	4,587	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Sustainability and Institutionalization of MRV Systems	26,484	-	-	-	26,484	-	-	26,484	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Strategic Planning for Integration, Sustainability	28,277	-	-	-	28,277	-	-	28,277	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Capacity Building for Strengthened Institutional Collaboration	-	28,277	-	-	28,277	-	-	28,277	Manila Observer
	Meeting - Stakeholder engagement and policy integration	-	17,441	-	-	17,441	-	-	17,441	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Strengthening Climate Data Collection and Validation Mechanisms	-	12,594	-	-	12,594	-	-	12,594	Manila Observer
	Meeting - Fostering Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing Across Institutions	-	15,578	-	-	15,578	-	-	15,578	Manila Observer
	Workshop - Training on MRV and GHG data collection	-	-	46,237	-	46,237	-	-	46,237	Manila Observer
	Meeting on establishment of a ETF System Focal Unit	-	-	-	13,375	13,375	-	-	13,375	Manila Observer
	Travel - Learning visit and international exposures for selected stakeholders (south-south exchanges, CBIT annual global meeting (5 meetings) - 5 ppl)	-	-	-	82,500	82,500	-	-	82,500	Manila Observer
	Travel - Participation in external seminars and training events relevant to Klima role in the project (e.g., climate transparency, MRV systems)	-	-	-	95,700	95,700	-	-	95,700	Manila Observer
Travel - Local travel for Klima staff attending project-related events and seminars	-	-	-	66,733	66,733	-	-	66,733	Manila Observer	
Travel - Supervision visits, M&E and Safeguards with stakeholders and partners	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000	Manila Observer	

Official Use Only
Page 78 of 79

ProDoc (CEO Endorsement) Budget Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD/Day)							Total (USD/Day)	Responsible Entity <i>Agency, GEF, UN, etc.</i>
		Component 1		Component 2	Component 3	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 3.1					
Personnel and Professional Services	Staff - Project Lead	26,307	26,307	26,307	26,307	111,221	--	47,817	159,138	Manda Observatory
	Staff - M&E and Safeguards Officer	7,271	7,271	13,243	13,243	47,040	27,803	--	74,843	Manda Observatory
	Staff - Finance & Admin Specialist	--	--	--	--	--	61,459	--	61,459	Manda Observatory
	Staff - Technical Specialist	20,949	20,949	47,804	47,804	126,560	--	--	126,560	Manda Observatory
	Staff - Liaison Officer	8,263	8,263	12,500	12,500	37,866	--	--	37,866	Manda Observatory
	Staff - Administrative Support	--	--	--	--	--	--	26,020	26,020	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Capacity Needs Assessment and Training Program Development	3,148	--	--	--	3,148	--	--	3,148	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Capacity Building on Technology Use and Data Integration	9,287	--	--	--	9,287	--	--	9,287	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Communication and Data Protocol	--	6,162	--	--	6,162	--	--	6,162	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Stakeholder Engagement and Policy Integration Plan for Data Sharing Platform	--	12,283	--	--	12,283	--	--	12,283	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - National Capacity Assessment GHG Data Collection and M&V	--	--	9,287	--	9,287	--	--	9,287	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Standardized Sectoral M&V Protocols and Emission Factors	--	--	9,912	--	9,912	--	--	9,912	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Gender-Sensitive Technical Guides and Reporting Frameworks	--	--	9,912	--	9,912	--	--	9,912	Manda Observatory
	Consultant/Facilitator - Comprehensive Training Program on M&V and GHG Data Collection	--	--	4,309	--	4,309	--	--	4,309	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Learning and Support Mechanisms	--	--	9,912	--	9,912	--	--	9,912	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - K&M Comprehensive Gender Responsive and Inclusive Policy Brief and Fact Sheets	--	--	--	4,480	4,480	--	--	4,480	Manda Observatory
	Consultant - Digital and Online Knowledge Sharing Platforms	--	--	--	27,920	27,920	--	--	27,920	Manda Observatory
	International Consultant - Project Termination Evaluation	--	--	--	--	--	30,300	--	30,300	DS
	Consultant - Annual Financial audit	--	--	--	--	--	--	6,000	6,000	Manda Observatory
Travel, Meetings and Workshops	Meeting - Multi-Stakeholder Consultation for the Establishment of Sectoral GHG Working Groups	5,880	--	--	--	5,880	--	--	5,880	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Institutional Strengthening and Technical Capacity Building for GHG Data Management	22,777	--	--	--	22,777	--	--	22,777	Manda Observatory
	Meeting - Operational Coordination Meetings of Sectoral GHG Working Groups	34,361	--	--	--	34,361	--	--	34,361	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Hands-On Training on M&V Equipment Use and Integration	22,777	--	--	--	22,777	--	--	22,777	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Integration of Sectoral Data with NCCEDS and the National GHG Inventory	2,369	--	--	--	2,369	--	--	2,369	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Sustainability and Institutionalization of M&V Systems	23,194	--	--	--	23,194	--	--	23,194	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Strategic Planning for Integration, Scalability, and Sustainability	22,777	--	--	--	22,777	--	--	22,777	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Capacity Building for Strengthened Institutional Collaboration	--	22,777	--	--	22,777	--	--	22,777	Manda Observatory
	Meeting - Stakeholder engagement and policy integration	--	14,140	--	--	14,140	--	--	14,140	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Strengthening Climate Data Collection and Validation Mechanisms	--	7,284	--	--	7,284	--	--	7,284	Manda Observatory
	Meeting - Fostering Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing Across Institutions	--	15,578	--	--	15,578	--	--	15,578	Manda Observatory
	Workshop - Training on M&V and GHG data collection	--	--	40,237	--	40,237	--	--	40,237	Manda Observatory
	Meeting on establishment of a BPR System for GHG Data	--	--	--	4,576	4,576	--	--	4,576	Manda Observatory
	Travel - Learning visit and international exposures for selected stakeholders (1 south-south exchanges, CBET annual global meeting 8 meetings, 1 day)	--	--	--	82,900	82,900	--	--	82,900	Manda Observatory
	Travel - Participation in external seminars and training events relevant to climate risk in the project (e.g., climate Resilient, urban systems)	--	--	--	95,700	95,700	--	--	95,700	Manda Observatory
	Travel - Local travel for climate staff attending project-related events and seminars	--	--	--	40,900	40,900	--	--	40,900	Manda Observatory

7/25/2025

Official Use Only
Page 79 of 80

09/18/2025

After reviewing the TORs again in the backdrop of the response provided by the Agency, we still don't see a very strong reason to have both the positions in the project. We strongly suggest value-for-money and cost-efficient use of scarce funds. Please revise the team structure and resubmit.

Agency Response

CI-GEF December 12, 2025

The government executing agency with the GEF OFP sent the email communication requesting the GEF's consideration for the staff position. The formal letter is also uploaded in the RoadMap section.

CI-GEF October 06, 2026

We appreciate the feedback on the staffing of the project. To provide a more country needs-based and contextualized response, the Philippines GEF OFP secretariat organized a meeting

with the Climate Change Commission (EA), Manila Observatory (support partner) and CI-GEF (IA) held last September 23, 2025. The meeting focused on the discussion on the value-for-money and cost-efficient use of the funds for the project while strongly considering the needs of the country to implement and deliver a CBIT project for ETF. As reflected in the ProDoc, the country has two main offices that work on ETF: the Climate Change Commission under the Office of the President and the Climate Change Services under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. In the meeting held, it was highlighted again that each office has its own information systems and processes. The current challenge of the country's attempt on ETF is the conflict or double work between these two offices. This situation resonates to the partners and data contributors, which adds to the reporting burden and mainstreaming transparency. Finally, the key stakeholders saw a Project Coordinator instead of Project Liaison Officer as a better fit for the CBIT project directly supporting the Project Lead. The position will focus on organizing and coordinating all activities between CCC and CCS units and all data providers mentioned in the ProDoc. The TOR for this position has been approved by the OFP, CCC, MO, and CI-GEF and uploaded in the portal.

CI-GEF 09/01/2025

1. Serving as the Executing Agency Support Partner (EASP) and Project Management Unit (PMU) of the CBIT Philippines project, Klima Center-Manila Observatory plays a crucial role in planning and implementing the four project components. The research institution will require adequate human resources to deliver its responsibilities throughout the project; thus, to complement the Terms of References (ToRs) of the Project Lead/Manager and Liaison Officer, this Explanatory Note delineates the similarities and differences of the two roles.

Roles of the Project Lead/Manager and Liaison Officer

The Project Lead/Manager acts as the lead coordinator throughout the duration of the project, working closely not only with the Liaison Officer, but with the other officers and stakeholders as well. More particularly, he/she leads the strategic direction, planning, and coordination in delivering the four components of the project.

The Liaison Officer is meant to assist the Project Lead/Manager by doing the leg work in coordinating and liaising with the various stakeholders involved in the project. As CBIT Philippines requires clear and efficient coordination with several government agencies, the Liaison Officer is responsible for facilitating collaboration among these stakeholders.

Side-by-side Comparison

Project Lead/Manager	Liaison Officer	Notes
-----------------------------	------------------------	--------------

<u>Project Coordination Functions</u> ? Report to the Head of Klima Center, the Executing Agency ? Oversee the project implementation, including administrative and financial aspects of the CBIT Philippines Project ? Coordinate with CI-GEF, the PSC, EA, TAG, and other partners and stakeholders throughout the course of the project ? Facilitate collaboration among government agencies, private sector partners, civil society organizations, and technical working groups to ensure effective data-sharing, alignment with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), and inclusive participation; ? Lead the implementation of day-to-day project operations, including work planning, budgeting, procurement, technical coordination, and progress monitoring of all initiatives under the CBIT Philippines Project ? Oversee the preparations and implementation of all components and outcomes of the project ? Attend high-level meetings ? Represent the EASP in conferences, forums, and other consortia activities ? Perform additional managerial functions as may be assigned by the Head of Klima Center, CI-GEF, and CCC, similar to and related to the functions enumerated above	<u>Project Coordination Functions</u> ? Provide support and report to the Head of Klima Center and the Project Manager/Lead of the CBIT Philippines Project ? Assist in managing relations with all project stakeholders at various levels throughout the course of the project ? Coordinate with the PSC, EA, TAG, and other partners and stakeholders throughout the course of the project ? Liaise and support in coordination to facilitate collaboration among stakeholders and technical working groups to ensure effective data-sharing, alignment with the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), and inclusive participation; ? Perform such other liaising and coordination functions as may be assigned by the Head of Klima Center, the Project Manager/Lead, and the EA.	The Project Lead/Manager and Liaison Officer will work closely with one another in all coordination-related tasks required for the project. Thus, several functions will be similar due to the centrality of public relations and coordination in both roles. However, the Project Lead/Manager leads the strategic direction of the project, oversees the implementation of all components, and performs more managerial functions. The Liaison Officer, on the other hand, will focus only on the coordination aspect.
---	--	--

<u>Technical Support</u> ? Provide technical assistance and guidance on ensuring gender-responsive and socially inclusive practices ? Consolidate existing efforts and offer technical support for the accurate, transparent, and efficient reporting of GHG emissions ? Participate in initiatives related to Trust Funds at the sub-regional level, ensuring alignment with existing Conservation Trust Fund activities ? Lead the quality execution of project activities and outputs through regular monitoring and evaluation ? Develop and prepare training materials and capacity-building programs ? Manage the project's knowledge sharing and dissemination, identifying and promoting best practices ? Lead and engage in policy dialogue and advocacy to promote the project and its findings	<u>Technical Support</u> ? Establish efficient and effective communication lines with all agencies and stakeholders ? Assist in strengthening coordination among national and private institutions in managing the sectoral and national GHGI system ? Assist in facilitating learning and knowledge sharing among all stakeholders ? Together with the Project Manager/Lead, M&E, and Safeguards Officer, liaise with project stakeholders to ensure delivery of project activities and outputs through regular monitoring and evaluation ? Coordinate and liaise with stakeholders to be actively engaged in policy dialogue and advocacy to promote the project and its findings ? Draft statements for project communication, when necessary.	The Project Manager/Lead is expected to deliver technical support in all aspects of the project. Apart from leading the strategic direction of the team, this role is also required to lead the capacity-building components of the project, represent the project in dialogues and conferences, and ensure the technical rigour of the project, among many others. The Liaison Officer is expected to deliver his/her technical expertise in relation to coordination and communication.
---	--	---

2. The formatting of the budget table has now been adjusted. The corrected version is included in the resubmission.

CI-GEF August 26, 2025

1. The TOR for the Liaison Officer has now been uploaded to facilitate assessment of role delineation with the Project Lead.

2. Staff and consultant costs have been adjusted to meet the recommended 25% threshold. It is important to note, however, that as a CBIT project, the implementation of the MRV system and engagement with government counterparts necessitate a higher level of technical and institutional support. We trust this context will be considered during the budget review.

CI-GEF August 14, 2025

1. Noted on the Liaison Officer. The TORs uploaded distinguish roles and ensure no overlap with the Project Lead.
2. Thank you for the feedback. We have uploaded the revised budget for your further review.
3. We have improved the formatting of the budget table in the PDF to ensure clarity.

CI-GEF July 24, 2025

1. The TOR for the Project Lead was included in the original submission and is resubmitted for reference. This TOR outlines both technical and managerial responsibilities, justifying the allocation of this position across project components and PMC. The Liaison Officer is charged solely to project components, as the role is focused on technical implementation and stakeholder engagement. As such, a TOR is not included under PMC justification for this position.

TORs provided

2. We recognize that staff and consultant costs currently represent 38% of the total project budget. After careful review, we have:

Reassessed the staffing structure and identified areas for cost optimization.

Revised the budget downward where feasible, while ensuring that the technical integrity and delivery capacity of the project are not compromised. Now Staff and Consultant costs are under 34%.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not Applicable

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Kindly address the comments in the review sheet, highlight the changes in the portal form in **yellow**, and resubmit.

While uploading the documents on the GEF Portal, classify the documents as "public".

09/18/2025

Kindly address the latest comments related to staffing and formatting, and re-submit.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/18/2025	7/24/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/12/2025	8/14/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)		8/26/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)		9/2/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/6/2025