

Strengthening national capacity for implementing the enhanced transparency framework in Palau

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11911
Countries
Palau
Project Name
Strengthening national capacity for implementing the enhanced transparency framework in Palau
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
3/10/2025
Review completed by PM
5/16/2025
Program Manager
Esteban Bermudez Forn
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

4/22/2025:

1. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. Please change the project sector from "Enabling Activity" to "Mixed & Others".

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

Project sector changed to "Mixed and Others".

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. Kindly change the Adaptation Rio Marker from ""No contribution (0)" to "Significant Objective (1)" to reflect the support of CBIT to CCA.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

Thanks. Rio Marker Changed to "Significant Objective".

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 3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

5/14/2025:

1. The GEF Project Financing and Co-financing contributions to PMC have been adjusted and are proportional (9.98%). Cleared.

4/22/2025:

1. The GEF Project Financing and Co-financing contributions to PMC have been adjusted to \$121,311 or 9.98% and \$5,000 or 5.26%, respectively. Please adjust the figures so that they are exactly proportional and equal to or below 10%.
2. Gender considerations have not been included in the output title, but additional clarifications have been incorporated in the project description. Cleared. Similarly, provisions have been included under the M&E to cover gender aspects. Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. The GEF Project Financing and Co-financing contributions to PMC are 9.08% and 10% respectively. Please adjust the figures so that they are exactly proportional and equal to or below 10%.
2. While some outputs make reference to gender mainstreaming within project components, kindly ensure that outstanding relevant Outputs (e.g., 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3), include gender dimensions explicitly in this section. In addition, Under M&E, ensure the new gender dimensions are reported and monitored on. Please amend accordingly.

Agency Response

Response: 12 May 2025

1. Co-financing contribution to PMC has been adjusted. Accordingly, necessary adjustments have been made to the co-financing contribution to the components. After adjustments, the GEF Project Financing and Co-financing contributions to PMC have been maintained to be equal and below 10%.

Response: 16 April 2025

1. The co-financing contribution to PMC has been adjusted accordingly.
2. Thanks. The gender dimensions have been further strengthened and explicitly incorporated into the relevant Outputs, including 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3. For ease of reference, sections which were part of the earlier version and with reference to gender mainstreaming are also highlighted in yellow. Additionally, provisions have been made under the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plan to ensure that these gender aspects are systematically monitored through gender-responsive indicators as well as gender targets.

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 NCI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. The following paragraph needs to be updated. Palau is preparing its NC3 with support of the EA project GEF ID 4498, which was CEO endorsed in 3/14/2012. The country is still yet to submit its NC3.

"Palau submitted its NC2 in 2013. The NC2 includes Palau's GHG emission information during 1994-2005. Palau has initiated the preparation of NC3. The expected completion was at the end of 2024, however, the finalization process is still underway. The NC3 aims to cover GHG inventory time series for 2006-2022, mitigation analysis, and vulnerability and adaptation assessment."

2. In line with the previous comment, please include in Table 3 the GEF ID and update the period accordingly for the project that is supporting the preparation of NC3.

Table 3: Baseline Projects

Project	Donor	Implementing Partner	Description of support	Period	Status and Notes
Republic of Palau Third National Communication to the UNFCCC	GEF	UNEP/Office of Climate Change	This project is under the Global Umbrella initiative, implemented through UNEP to support countries prepare their NC3 for the UNFCCC.	2022-2026	Ongoing- The project aims to update information provided regarding national circumstances, inventories of GHG, policies and measures undertaken to mitigate climate change, assessments of vulnerability to climate change, and steps taken to adapt. The CBIT project will leverage the institutional arrangement in the NC3 preparation by building upon the coordination mechanism established under this project.
Review and update of	SPC	PEWA/ OCC	This project focuses on updating the first NDC.	2023-202	Ongoing-

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

1. The paragraph has been revised as suggested.

2. Table 3 has been updated with the suggested changes.

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

4/22/2025:

Component 1:

- 1. Noted. Cleared.
- 2. 1 and 2.2. Cleared
- 3. Cleared
- 4. Cleared
- 5. Cleared
- 6. Cleared

Component 2:

- 1. Cleared
- 2. Noted. Cleared.
- 3. Cleared
- 4. Noted. Cleared
- 5. Cleared

Component 3:

- 1. Cleared
- 2. Cleared
- 3. Cleared

3/27/2025:

Component 1:

1. [General] It would be relevant to specify if the interventions will focus on specific sectors. For example, they could address relevant sectors to the NDC, e.g., energy (including transport) and waste.
2. Regarding Activity 1.1.3, the writing is ambiguous. It states that *"Three (3) Data-sharing agreements will be developed for each ministry responsible for providing activity data"*.
 1. In line with the first comment, would it be possible to specify which ministries will participate in Activity 1.1.3? If so, please include them. If it isn't possible to specify the ministries, please include a disclaimer that this activity will focus on ministries related to the sectors that are relevant to the country's NDC and GHG emissions.
 2. Why are 3 data-sharing agreements needed for each ministry? Wouldn't it be 3 data-sharing agreements with 3 different ministries? Please correct or justify.
3. Activity 1.1.4 could help to strengthen Activity 1.1.3. The consultations and validation workshops could help improve engagement from relevant ministries and test the flow of information intended by the data-sharing agreements.
4. Please specify if local academia (e.g., University of the South Pacific) will be engaged as part of the activities in Output 1.2. For example, a "train the trainers" approach could be employed under Activity 1.2.1 to foster sustainability and replication.
5. Given the limited funding, kindly indicate if the training series of activity 1.2.3 will focus on a selected sectorial scope on MRV systems, considering factors such as relative share of emissions and / or national priorities. Kindly complement accordingly.
6. For activities 1.3.2 and 1.3.3., and considering limited funding and national priorities, kindly indicate the potential technical / sectorial scopes of the regional peer exchange workshop and the training and knowledge sharing activities around the ETF. Please elaborate accordingly.

Component 2:

1. For Output 2.1 and 2.2, and considering limited funding and national priorities, kindly indicate the potential GHG emission categories within the four IPCC sectors to be covered. Please elaborate accordingly.
2. In addition, and particularly for activity 2.1.5, please indicate what mechanism or strategy will be in place to guarantee sustained creations of capacities on data collection and use of the IPCC Inventory Software to overcome potential staff turnover. Kindly briefly explain accordingly.
3. In addition, and particularly for activity 2.2.3, please indicate what mechanism or strategy will be in place to guarantee sustained creations of capacities on QA/QC guidelines for GHG inventories to overcome potential staff turnover. Kindly briefly explain accordingly.
4. For Output 2.3, and considering limited funding and national priorities, kindly elaborate on the potential sectorial scope of the modules of the GHG Inventory Database Management System to be developed. Please provide the prioritized GHG emission categories to be covered.
5. In addition, and particularly for activity 2.3.5, please indicate what mechanism or strategy will be in place to guarantee sustained creations of capacities on the use of the GHG

DBMS software to overcome potential staff turnover. Kindly briefly explain accordingly.

Component 3:

1. For Outputs 3.1 and 3.2, considering limited funding and the economy-wide nature of NDCs, please indicate if the sectorial scope of the output, particularly as it relates to the design and implementation of the IT-based NDC tracking system and the data collection protocols (including QA/QC), and guidance manual will include all the sectors covered by Palau's NDCs.
2. Moreover, for activities 3.1.5 and 3.2.4, please indicate what mechanism or strategy will be in place to guarantee sustained creations of capacities on the use of the IT-based NDC tracking system and its QA/QC protocols respectively to overcome potential staff turnover. Kindly briefly explain accordingly.
3. For activity 3.3.3, please indicate what mechanism or strategy will be in place to guarantee sustained creations of capacities on climate support tracking o overcome potential staff turnover. Kindly briefly explain accordingly.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

Component 1:

1. Relevant sectors and sub-sectors are specified where applicable. For GHG inventory, all IPCC sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU and waste) are covered by the project. The categories and sub-categories within the IPCC sectors will be determined by the scoping paper in activity 2.1.1.

For NDC tracking, sectors include Energy (Electricity, Transport and Energy-Other Sector (commercial/households), AFOLU and Waste. These are based on draft Updated NDC of Palau.

2. Thanks for highlighting.

Activity 1.1.3 has been revised to provide more clarity. Three individual data-sharing agreements will be established between the Office of Climate Change and the following entities: (1) the Ministry of Finance, (2) the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and the Environment, and (3) the Environmental Quality Protection Board. The specific data responsibilities of each entity are also mentioned within Activity 1.1.3. In addition to the above, as suggested, a disclaimer is also added now in the narrative under Output 1.1.

3. Activity 1.1.4 has been expanded to emphasize that consultations and validation workshops will facilitate ministerial engagement and test the effectiveness of data-sharing agreements.

4. As per the feedback, the involvement of local/regional academia is mentioned in activity 1.2.3, which includes a training series on ETF. Further, the approach on "training the trainers" in activity 1.2.1 ?A long-term strategy for capacity development on ETF? has been updated to address the comment.

5. In alignment with the approach mentioned in the response to comment 1, the training series under activity 1.2.3 will maintain a broad scope, focusing on general ETF/MRV principles as well as GHG inventory in all sectors. However, for the NDC tracking module, the focus will be on the high-emitting sector/national priorities. Minor revisions have been made accordingly in the activity table.

6. Activity 1.3.2 focuses on facilitating knowledge and experiences sharing on ETF-related activities,

challenges, and lessons learned for implementing ETF.

As for activity 1.3.3 is concerned, the focus is on participation in knowledge sharing and training opportunities organized by other platforms where selected Palau government officials and relevant stakeholders will be supported to attend. The technical/sectoral scope of 1.3.3 will be guided by the national priorities related to transparency and sector-specific needs as communicated by the government partner. Additional details have been added to 1.3.3 provide this clarity.

Component 2:

1. For output 2.1, all IPCC sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU and waste) will be covered by the project. The potential GHG emission categories within the IPCC sectors will be determined by the scoping paper in activity 2.1.1.

For output 2.2, general QA/QC guidelines applicable to all the IPCC sectors will be developed. Training programmes will engage relevant stakeholders from each IPCC sector (Energy, IPPU, AFOLU, and Waste).

2. The capacity building strategy (activity 1.2.1) is aimed at sustained capacity development beyond project duration. Additional details have been added to 1.2.1, explicitly mentioning the development of the strategy in consideration of all training related activities (2.1.5, 2.2.3, 2.3.5, 3.1.5, 3.2.4 & 3.3.3), to ensure sustained capacity creation and mitigation of potential staff turnover beyond the project period. Further the strategy developed will include 'training the trainers', which will foster sustainability and replication of capacity building initiatives, ensuring sustainability and wider impact.

3. Kindly refer to the above response to comment (2)

5. Kindly refer to the above response to comment (2). In addition, it may be please note that the User manual (2.3.4) will be designed to ensure the creation of knowledge and skills leading to sustenance of the intended activity and mitigate the issue of potential staff turnover.

4. Information added. The output of 2.3 will cover all the IPCC sectors (Energy, IPPU, AFOLU and Waste).

Component 3:

1. Sectoral coverage added. The outputs 3.1 and 3.2 will focus the NDC actions in Energy (Electricity, Transport and Energy-Other Sector), AFOLU and Waste sectors, in alignment with the latest NDC (in draft), available in this link: https://www.palau.gov.pw/wp-content/uploads/DRAFT_Palau-Enhanced-NDC-2025-2030-SPC_NDCHUB_etc.pdf

2. The capacity building strategy (activity 1.2.1) is aimed at sustained capacity development beyond project duration. Additional details have been added to 1.2.1, explicitly mentioning the development of the strategy in consideration of all training related activities (2.1.5, 2.2.3, 2.3.5, 3.1.5, 3.2.4 & 3.3.3), to ensure sustained capacity creation and mitigation of potential staff turnover beyond the project period. Further the strategy developed will include 'training the trainers', which will foster sustainability and replication of capacity building initiatives, ensuring sustainability and wider impact. The User manual for these activities will be designed to ensure the creation of knowledge and skills leading to sustenance of the intended activity and mitigate the issue of potential staff turnover.

3. Kindly refer to the above response to comment 2.

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 Request3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

4/22/2025:

1. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. The project team expects 50 people benefiting from this CBIT project (25 male and 25 female). Considering the inclusion of non-State actors and the subscription of long-term capacity building agreements to be established, kindly confirm if it will be possible to raise the total number of people benefitting from the project. Kindly amend accordingly, if deemed possible.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

The number of beneficiaries has been revised to 70 (35 male, 35 female), considering the scope of beneficiaries related to peer exchange/knowledge sharing activities. The relevant sections in the proposal have been revised accordingly.

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 Request3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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 3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. In Section D on Policy Requirements Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, the Agency is requested to respond (Yes or No) to the sub-question: Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 seem to demonstrate that the project is going to generate these benefits. Please adjust.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

Thanks. Adjusted accordingly.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. The Gender Action Plan is included in Annex K of the Agency Project Document and has been submitted separately in the project's documents section. Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. Kindly upload the Gender Action Plan to the GEF Portal for further review.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

The Gender Action Plan has been submitted as Annex K of the Agency Project Document. However, as per the suggestion, it is also uploaded as a standalone document under the ?Document Section?.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is included in Annex K of the Agency Project Document and has been submitted separately in the project's documents section. Cleared.
2. Cleared
3. Cleared

3/27/2025:

1. Kindly upload the Gender Action Plan to the GEF Portal for further review.
2. Table 5, as it relates to stakeholder engagement, currently does not include a reference to local / regional academia (i.e. University of the South Pacific), which has been named as a potential player in the long-term strategies for building capacities overtime on the ETF in the country. Kindly include local academia and their relationships with the project components accordingly in Table 5 and throughout the document as appropriate.
3. Kindly provide more details on the specific NGOs, CSOs, community and women groups to be engaged in the project beyond the generic assertion that they? will be engaged to assist in consultation?. Please name specific NGOs, CSOs, community and women groups to be engaged and consulted and provide more details on the project approach, plans, means and timelines of engagement related to project components, outputs and activities.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

1. We think that the term Gender Action Plan has been mentioned invertedly instead of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been submitted as Annex L of the Agency Project Document. However, as per the suggestion, it is also uploaded as a standalone document under the ?Document Section?.

2. Addressed. Academia is added to the stakeholder engagement in Table 5 and Annex L2, along with their role in project.

3. Addressed. Examples of such organizations and how they can contribute to components 1 and 3 as well as being a PSC member, are presented in the Stakeholder engagement table in Table 5 and Annex L of the CEO Endorsement Document.

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025:

1. Noted. Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. Please refer to our comments in the Budget Table as there are opportunities to reduce the overall GEF grant for this project.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

The comments on the budget table have been addressed. Basis discussions with the Government, responses to GEF comments including the upward revision of the targeted beneficiaries and in consideration of the scope of the project which covers the critical elements necessary to support the ETF implementation, we propose to maintain the grant level.

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

4/22/2025:

1. Annex D has been updated. Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. The PPG table in Annex D doesn't add up. The Agency is requesting \$40,000 for PPG. It is stated that \$39,216 have been spent to date and \$5,633 are committed. Kindly review these numbers so that the amount spent to date and the amount committed add up the total PPG amount. Please amend accordingly. ?

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

We regret the oversight. Based on the latest financial figures, the updates/amendments have been made accordingly.

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 Request

4/22/2025:

1. The updated LOE matches the funds table. Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. The LOE submitted is different from the LOE template. Please resubmit the LOE using the GEF-8 LOE template to review if the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

LoE dated 27th March 2025 in the appropriate template is resubmitted.

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

4/22/2025:

1. The co-financing letter has been uploaded to the document's section. No further comments to the co-financing letter. Cleared.
2. The category has been changed to "recurrent expenditures". Cleared.

3/27/2025:

1. The recipient country is confirming \$100,000 as in-kind co-finance. Nevertheless, the co-finance letter has not been submitted. Please upload for further review and assessment.
2. Please complete the "investment mobilized" category for the OCC, Office of the President as source of cofinancing.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

1. Co-financing letter dated 26th March 2025 is submitted as part of this revision.

2. Category and source of the co-financing clarified in Table H.2

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 Request

4/22/2025:

1. Ms. Charlene Mersai signed the updated LoE on 03/27/2025, and the proposal was submitted on 3/10/2025. Despite a new OFP, Ms. Lincy Lee Marino, since 03/28/2025, the provided LOE is accepted. Cleared.

3/27/2025: Yes. A Letter of Endorsement (LOE) has been submitted by Ms. Charlene Mersai, Operational Focal Point of Palau since 2021-04-02.

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

LoE dated 27th March 2025 in the appropriate template is resubmitted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025: A revised LOE has been uploaded. Cleared.

3/27/2025: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2025: A revised letter has been uploaded with the right format. Cleared.

3/27/2025: No, the LOE submitted in the portal is different from the LOE template. Please resubmit the LOE signed by the OFP using the GEF-8 LOE template (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-8-operational-focal-point-endorsement-letter>).

December 12, 2022
NEPC 22-11

Mr. Sudhir Sharma
GEF Task Manager, Asia Pacific
United Nations Environment Programme
Bangkok, Thailand
Email: sharma66@un.org

Subject: Invitation to support Palau in preparing a Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) project under CBIT set aside funds of GEF

In my capacity as GEF Operation Focal Point for Palau, I would like to invite UNEP, as the implementing agency to develop a project proposal under CBIT set aside funds of GEF to support the strengthening of Enhanced Transparency Framework of Palau. This will contribute to the Government of Palau's reporting obligations under the Paris Agreement, in accordance with national priorities.

I also request to develop the project as a one-step process and use its resources for advance on PPG funds and recover from GEF as part of approval of full proposal, which GEF grant for developing the full proposal. In line with above request, the Letter of Endorsement (LOE) issued will reflect the funds used for full proposal development as PPG funds.

I also understand that the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) could provide support as technical partner both for developing the GEF project document as well as in execution of the project. I would like UNEP to undertake the preparation of full project document with support of GGGI.

We look forward to UNEP and GGGI support and working closely with key agencies of Government of Palau to develop the Full Project document.

Sincerely,


Charlene Mersai
National Environment Coordinator
GEF Operational Focal Point for Palau

CC: Ms Katerina Syngellakis, Pacific Regional Director, GGGI (katerina.syngellakis@gggi.org)

CC: Subrata Sinha, OIC, Pacific Sub-Regional Office Head (Subrata.sinha@unep.org)

Agency Response

Response: 16 April 2025

LoE dated 27th March 2025 in the appropriate template is resubmitted.

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 Request N/A

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

5/14/2025:

1. Core Indicator 11 has been included in the Project Results Framework. Cleared.

4/22/2025:

1. Thank you for including a gender-disaggregated targets where possible. As mentioned in our previous comment, also include core indicator 11 as part of the Project Results Framework.

3/27/2025:

1. Please include the core indicator 11 as part of the Project Results Framework.

Agency Response

Response: 12 May 2025

Thanks for the suggestion. Necessary adjustments have been made in the PRF to reflect the core indicator 11.

Response: 16 April 2025

A gender target has been added to the PRF wherever relevant. The target includes disaggregation by gender.

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 3/27/2025: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 3/27/2025: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

7/28/2025:

1. The Agency has revised the TORs and added an organigram to the institutional arrangements section to clarify perceived duplication between the Chief Technical

Advisor (CTA) and the National Technical Coordinator (NTC). The comment has been cleared by the PM and is pending clearance from O&P, who raised it.

- Regarding the Project Compliance Officer and Project Associate, both charged under PMC, the Agency responded that maintaining two positions or merging them would not affect the PMC budget. This comment has also been cleared by the PM and is pending O&P's clearance.

5/27/2025:

The Operations and Policy Division of the GEF reviewed the resubmission of project GEF ID 11911 in Palau. They have found that the comments in the budget table presented on 3/27/2025: remain un-addressed i.e. no reduction in staff costs and no merging of different positions.

- After the Terms of References were reviewed, it is still considered that at least two positions (the costliest) not only have overlapping responsibilities, but also that one of them is very costly. These positions are the National Technical Coordinator (valued at \$201,758) and the Chief Technical Adviser (valued at \$101,235). Below, the deliverables (color-coded) that appear repetitive in both positions can be found. Additionally, the time that either position will allocate to the project is not clearly indicated?this can be presented in the budget table, section "Detailed Description.

Scope of work: Providing support in administrative duties of the project as well as in maintaining and verifying project/output level budget execution and controls; supporting procurement plans, consultants' contracts, hiring and subcontracting plans to align with GGGI policies, standards and donor requirements. Deliverables under his/her direct responsibility: • Establish recruitment and contracts management • Procurement of services and goods • Financial reporting and audit reports Deliverables for which his/her will provide support: Support and provide guidance to Project Manager and PMU with administrative and finance related tasks Minimum requirements: • Bachelor's in any of the following disciplines: business administration, finance, accounting, economics, management & public administration, development studies • At least 3 years of experience in financial management and/or project budget management • Experience in organizing workshops and logistics • Strong organizational skills and attention to detail • Knowledge of climate change issues would be an advantage	National Technical Coordinator Duty station: Koror, Palau Reports to: Project Manager, GGGI with functional reporting to GGGI and dual reporting to National Project Director within Office of Climate Change Type of procurement: Open recruitment Scope of work: Technical delivery of assigned deliverables. Support in donor reporting and stakeholder management and relationships. Embedded within the Government project executing agency. Deliverables under his/her direct responsibility: • 1.1.2 - UNFCCC reporting institutional arrangements and process guideline document • 1.1.3 - Data Sharing Agreement for data providers for both GHG inventory and NDC tracking • 1.1.4 - Guidance manual for data collection, calculation and compilation of data • 2.1.9 - GHG estimation calculation spreadsheets and guidance on using the spreadsheets • 2.2.6 - A strategy document for long term operation of the GHG DBMS • 3.1.6 - A training series on GHG inventory data collection, calculation and compilation of data • 3.2.3 - Guidance manual for data collection, calculation and compilation of data • 3.2.4 - Training workshops on NDC implementation tracking system • 3.3.2 - Data collection template and protocol developed for climate support received and required
---	---

113

3.3.3 - Training workshops on climate support Deliverables for which his/her will provide support: • 1.1.1 - Stocktake/zero assessment and design option report on the current institutional arrangements • 1.2.2 - A gender integration guiding framework and gender monitoring plan • 1.2.4 - A training series on ETT/MNV in collaboration with existing partners and platforms • 1.3.1 - Regional peer exchange workshops report organized • 1.3.2 - Participation in training and knowledge sharing activities on ETT and climate change • 1.3.3 - A report on international best practices and lessons learnt for climate transparency • 2.1.1 - Scoping paper on gaps, status and availability of data for assessing GHG inventory • 3.1.2 - Data collection templates and protocols for GHG data collection developed • 3.1.4 - A guidance manual for GHG inventory data collection, calculation and compilation • 2.1.5 - GHG inventory training workshops • 2.2.1 - Guidelines on QA/QC procedures for GHG inventory • 2.2.2 - Training materials on the application of QA/QC procedures/system to GHG inventory • 2.3.1 - A scoping paper on IT-based GHG database management systems (DBMS), assessing the needs and scope for the system • 2.3.2 - A design report for the GHG DBMS to set system requirements specifications • 2.3.3 - GHG DBMS developed, including plotting/user acceptance testing • 2.3.4 - User manual for GHG DBMS • 2.3.5 - Training program on GHG DBMS • 3.1.1 - A scoping paper on IT-based NDC tracking system • 3.1.2 - A design report for the IT-based NDC tracking system to set system requirements specifications • 3.1.3 - IT-based NDC implementation tracking system developed, including plotting/user acceptance testing • 3.1.4 - User manual for IT-based NDC implementation tracking system • 3.1.5 - Training workshops on IT-based NDC implementation tracking system • 3.2.1 - A scoping paper on NDC tracking data availability and requirements and a review of existing methodologies • 3.2.2 - Data collection template and protocol for NDC implementation, including QA/QC developed • 3.3.1 - A scoping report on data availability and requirements, data providers and existing methodologies for climate support monitoring and reporting Minimum requirements: • Bachelor's degree in Development Studies, Environmental Science and other related fields • Minimum 5 years of project management experience including donor-funded projects • Proven experience in climate change or environmental projects, preferably in NDC projects • Strong interpersonal skills and relationship building • Ability to take initiatives and work with minimum supervision	Chief Technical Adviser Duty station: Rome, PG (Pacific Region) Reports to: Regional Director, GGGI
---	---

114

Type of procurement: Existing Staff - GGGI Scope of work: • Oversight of quality assurance of technical deliverables - institutional arrangements, capacity building strategy and partnership engagement • Liaison with external/government parties for high level consultation and negotiations on UNFCCC reporting governance structure by ensuring with existing national frameworks • Technical delivery of assigned deliverables Deliverables under his/her direct responsibility: • 1.1.1 - A long-term strategy for capacity development on ETT including action plan and financing strategy • 1.1.2 - Regional peer exchange workshops organized • 1.3.2 - Participation in training and knowledge sharing activities on ETT and climate change Deliverables for which his/her will provide support: • 1.1.1 - Stocktake/zero assessment and design option report on the current institutional arrangements • 1.1.2 - UNFCCC reporting institutional arrangements and process guideline document • 1.1.3 - Data Sharing Agreement for data providers for both GHG inventory and NDC tracking • 1.1.4 - Consultations and validation workshop • 1.3.2 - A Gender integration guiding framework and gender monitoring plan • 1.3.3 - A report on international best practices and lessons learnt for climate transparency Minimum requirements: • Master's degree in Development Studies, Environmental Science and other related fields • Proven experience in climate change or environmental projects, preferably managing NDC projects • Strong negotiation skills and proven experience in partnership engagement	International MRV/ GHG Inventory Expert Duty station: Pacific region (TUG) Reports to: Chief Technical Expert Type of procurement: Existing Staff - GGGI Scope of work: Working on a broad assignment on a part-time basis to support technical aspects of project delivery. Technical oversight and input to deliverables ensuring quality assurance in line with GGGI and donor requirements Deliverables under his/her direct responsibility: • 1.3.3 - A training series on ETT/MNV in collaboration with existing partners and platforms.
--	--

115

- Additionally, the item "Project Management Support" (that looked like an administrative charge) in the previous budget table, is now transformed to "Project Compliance Officer" (see below in red rectangle).

The deliverables for this position are:

- Legal review and quality assurance of consultant and vendor contracts
- Due diligence on procurement processes, including compliance checks against donor and GGGI regulations
- Risk register maintenance related to legal and HR aspects of project delivery

The Project Associate (Admin and Finance) [in green rectangle below] can assume these deliverables. Kindly remove the Project Compliance Officer budget line.

GEF Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)						Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1 Outcome 1	Component 2 Outcome 2	Component 3 Outcome 3	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
Goods	Publication	10,000	10,000	-	20,000			20,000	GGGI
Contractual Services – Company	IT firm - development of IT-based GHG Database Management System and NDC tracking tool	-	130,000	60,000	190,000			190,000	GGGI
International Consultants	MRV/GHG Inventory Specialist	35,000	82,500	45,000	162,500			162,500	GGGI
	UNEP Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	-	50,000		50,000	UNEP
	IT Specialist	-	36,000	28,000	64,000			64,000	GGGI
	International GHG Inventory Expert	-	23,092	-	23,092			23,092	GGGI
	QA/QC Specialist	-	17,500	-	17,500			17,500	GGGI
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Chief Technical Expert	101,235	-	-	101,235			101,235	GGGI
	National Technical Coordinator	47,288	80,099	74,371	201,758			201,758	GGGI
	International MRV Expert	30,455	61,898	60,215	152,568			152,568	GGGI
	Communications and Knowledge Management Expert	5,879	-	-	5,879			5,879	GGGI
	GESI Expert	11,258	-	-	11,258	5,759		17,017	GGGI
	MEL (Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning) Expert	-	-	-	-	16,343		16,343	GGGI
	Project Manager						10,000	10,000	GGGI
	Project Compliance Officer	-	-	-	-		17,855	17,855	GGGI
	Project Associate (Admin & Finance)	-	-	-	-		62,947	62,947	GGGI

5/14/2025:

0. The Umoja budget is now visible. Cleared.
1. Further clarification has been provided related to the National Technical Coordinator and the Chief Technical Expert, their roles, deliverables, and complementarity. Cleared.
2. N/A
3. A breakdown of the travel costs has been provided by the Agency in their response from May 12, 2025, which justifies the current travel budget. Given the remoteness of the country and the need for international travel, the justification is sufficient. Cleared.
4. Further clarification has been provided related to the National Technical Coordinator and the Chief Technical Expert, their roles, deliverables, and complementarity. Cleared.
5. TORs have been revised, and further clarification has been provided, as noted in comment 4. Cleared.

4/22/2025:

0. Please adjust the size of the columns of the UMOJA budget. As it is presented right now, it is hard to read:

UNEP Template

Component	Description	Executing Agency	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total	UMOJA description
	National Technical Coordinator	GGGI	18,519	18,166	10,603	-	47,288	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	Chief Technical Expert	GGGI	36,336	31,955	32,924	-	101,235	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	International MRV Expert	GGGI	10,926	14,375	5,152	-	30,453	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	MRV/GHG		2	1	-	-	35	

1. Please refer to our comment #4. We recommend reallocating the budget to achieve project goals rather than on managerial roles.
2. N/A
3. Thank you for your explanation. Could you please provide further details on the outputs that necessitate travel, explaining why these activities need to be conducted in person rather than virtually? Additionally, please include an estimated breakdown to justify the requested travel budget of \$177k.
4. Thank you for your explanation. However, based on the TORs you have provided, there still seems to be an overlap between certain positions. For example, between the National Technical Coordinator and the Chief Technical Expert. Both (1) work on technical deliverables (especially institutional arrangements, training, capacity building, and GHG/NDC systems), (2) are involved in workshops, training, data protocols, and guidance documentation, and (3) support each other on multiple deliverables. Considering the limited resources, we encourage you to revisit the design of these positions with the aim to reduce their costs and avoid potential overlaps. If possible, kindly merge these positions (e.g. is it possible to merge the National Technical Coordinator and the Chief Technical Expert given their overlap?).
5. Given that other positions (i.e., Project Manager, the Project Associate (Administration & Finance), the National Technical Coordinator, or the Chief Technical Expert) are doing managerial tasks under the supervision of GGGI, that there is overlap between some of them (as mentioned in comment #4), we can't accept another budget line for Project Management Support. If these are activities to be executed by the aforementioned positions, please detailed them in their respective TOR.

3/27/2025:

1. Salary and benefits/Staff costs at 44% of the project budget is quite high. Please consider revising the budget.

Row Labels	Sum of Total (USDeq.)
Contractual Services – Company	190,000
Goods	20,000
International Consultants	299,092
Office Supplies	6,000
Other Operating Costs	5,000
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	585,609
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	53,289
Travel	177,257
Grand Total	1,336,247

- 2.
3. The travel budget adds up to \$ 177k or 13% of the total project budget. Kindly justify the need for such an amount and consider reducing it to the extent possible. Please amend accordingly and briefly explain why it will only include missions to Samoa, if deemed appropriate.?

Travel	Travel cost for missions to Palau under Component 1	88,000	-	-	88,000		88,000	GGGI
	Travel cost for missions to Palau under Component 2	-	49,000	-	49,000		49,000	GGGI
	Travel cost for missions to Palau under Component 3	-	-	20,757	20,757		20,757	GGGI
	Travel cost for missions to Palau under PMC and M&E					19,500	19,500	GGGI

4. The three positions, namely ?Chief Technical Expert?, ?National Technical Coordinator? and ?Project Manager? seem to be overlapping and can be combined to reduce the costs. Moreover, the TORs annexed to the prodoc combine the Project Manager and Chief Technical Expert into one single TOR.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)						Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3					
Goods	Publication	10,000	10,000	-	20,000			20,000	GGGI
Contractual Services -- Company	IT firm - development of IT-based GHG Database Management System and NDC tracking tool	-	190,000	60,000	190,000			190,000	GGGI
International Consultants	MRV/GHG Inventory Specialist	35,000	82,500	45,000	162,500			162,500	GGGI
	UNEP Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	-	30,000		30,000	UNEP
	IT Specialist	-	36,000	28,000	64,000			64,000	GGGI
	International GHG Inventory Expert	-	25,082	-	25,082			25,082	GGGI
	QA/QC Specialist	-	17,500	-	17,500			17,500	GGGI
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Chief Technical Expert	101,235	-	-	101,235			101,235	GGGI
	National Technical Coordinator	47,288	80,099	74,371	201,758			201,758	GGGI
	International MRV Expert	30,458	61,898	60,215	152,566			152,566	GGGI
	Communications and Knowledge Management Expert	5,879	-	-	5,879			5,879	
	GESI Expert	11,258	-	-	11,258	5,759		17,017	GGGI
	MEL (Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning) Expert	-	-	-	-	16,343		16,343	UNEP
	Project Manager	-	-	-	-		10,009	10,009	GGGI
	Project Management Support	-	-	-	-		17,855	17,855	GGGI

5. The Project Management Support is unclear. In line with the previous comment, consider merging it with the other positions or clarify why this is needed and has to be separated from the other positions.

Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Chief Technical Expert	101,235	-	-	101,235			101,235	GGGI
	National Technical Coordinator	47,288	80,099	74,371	201,758			201,758	GGGI
	International MRV Expert	30,453	61,898	60,215	152,566			152,566	GGGI
	Communications and Knowledge Management Expert	5,879	-	-	5,879			5,879	
	GESI Expert	11,258	-	-	11,258	5,759		17,017	GGGI
	MEL (Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning) Expert	-	-	-	-	16,343		16,343	UNEP
	Project Manager	-	-	-	-		10,009	10,009	GGGI
	Project Management Support	-	-	-	-		17,855	17,855	GGGI
	Project Associate (Admin & Finance)	-	-	-	-		62,947	62,947	GGGI

Agency Response

Response: 25 July 2025

Thank you for the further review and comments.

0. To clarify the positions of this project, we have added a diagram under the institutional arrangements section:

The CTE is a regional-based staff, a shared resource across other CBIT projects in the region executed by GGGI and implemented by UNEP, who will provide oversight of quality assurance of technical deliverables and engage directly with the donor and project partners at a

higher level. CTE is accountable for the work delivered by NTC. CTE's time is part-time to the project, as is the salary.

Further as submitted earlier, this unique arrangement of having a regional resource (shared between CBIT projects) would support in:

- addressing the lack of limited expertise at the country's level while ensuring successful project delivery and capacity enhancement of national personnel (NTC who is a full-time project staff based in Palau);
- leveraging the advantage of implementing similar CBIT projects at the same time.

1. ToR/ responsibilities for both positions (National Technical Coordinator and Chief Technical Expert):

Following a detailed review of the ToRs and assigned deliverables, we were unable to identify the duplication of deliverables under the direct responsibility of either of the individuals. On two deliverables, 1.2.2 and 1.3.3, both individuals were to support deliverable preparation (but not lead it). We have deleted this duplication, thanks for identifying it.

In some cases, the NTC will support deliverables under the guidance of the Chief Technical Expert (CTE). For example, for Deliverable 1.1.4 (consultation and validation workshops highlighted in green), the NTC will lead the national consultations and validation of institutional arrangements, with support and guidance from the CTE. Deliverable 1.3.1 (regional peer exchange workshop) will be led by the CTE, as it involves broader regional collaboration. Similarly, the NTC will lead the in-country training activities under Deliverables 3.2.4 and 3.3.3, while Deliverable 1.3.2, which involves identifying suitable regional/global training opportunities for government officials, will be led by the CTE due to its strategic coordination requirements. The ToRs have been reviewed and strengthened.

Cost for NTC (USD \$201,758): This reflects a full-time project coordinator role over the four-year project period (USD \$50,439.50 per year). The salary level was proposed by the government partner based on prevailing market rates in the Pacific Islands, and significant challenges in recruiting qualified staff in this region, to ensure the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel necessary for effective project delivery. It is reiterated that limited personnel resources exist in Pacific countries, and this cost may kindly be seen from that perspective. This arrangement has been explained further through the diagram on micro-institutional arrangements added in section B4 (Institutional Arrangement and Coordination).

2. The GEF secretariat's comment is that the Project Associate would be able to assume the deliverables of the Project Compliance Officer. To do so, the salary of the Project Associate would have to be increased by the budget allocated to the Project Compliance Officer (USD 17,855) to take on these additional responsibilities. The Project Associate would not be able to incorporate these additional responsibilities without this added budget. Noting that both roles are financed through PMC, either having one person or two would not impact the project budget. The question comes down to whether it is believed that one person or two people would ensure more effective and efficient project delivery.

We would like to highlight that this project, including its institutional arrangements and budget, has been developed through a six-month PPG phase process which drew upon significant stakeholder consultations and desk review. It also draws upon UNEP's and GGGI's lessons learned in implementing projects in the Pacific region and beyond.

In this particular case, one of the outcomes from this process was the identification that two people would ensure a more efficient and effective project delivery. The Project Associate (Admin and Finance) a part-time resource spread across projects, based in the regional office (at Suva, Fiji), will initiate and coordinate procurement and recruitment processes. The Project Compliance Officer, also a part-time resource, will lead contract review and issuance of vendors, consultants, and service providers. Having two part-time resources working together and in parallel will ensure faster project procurement and payment, quicker delivery of project goods and services, reduced risk, and enhanced project impact.

The TORs of both positions have been updated to clarify this further.

It may be kindly noted that the above referred part-time resources will also be co-financed by GGGI (co-financing figures have been updated to reflect this contribution and a letter has been attached).

Response: 12 May 2025

0. Respectfully, we are not able to identify the location where the budget table was distorted. However, we have reattached the budget (which is seen at our end as follows).

AutoSave Off GEF8_Palau CBIT_Revision 02 • Saved

File Home Insert Draw Design Layout References Mailings Review View Help Acrobat Table Design Table Layout Comments Reviewing Share

Clipboard Font Paragraph Styles Editing Adobe Acrobat Voice Sensitivity Editor Add-ins Document Cloud

UNEP Template

Component	Description	Executing Agency	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total	UNMOJA description
Component 1	National Technical Coordinator	GGGI	18,519	18,166	10,603	-	47,288	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	Chief Technical Expert	GGGI	36,336	31,975	32,924	-	101,235	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	International MRV Expert	GGGI	10,926	14,375	5,152	-	30,453	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	MRV/GHG Inventory Specialist	Ext	20,000	15,000	-	-	35,000	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	GESI Expert	GGGI	8,231	3,028	-	-	11,258	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	Communications and Knowledge Management Expert	GGGI	5,879				5,879	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)
	Workshops/Trainings/Meetings		1,500	19,700	4,000	-	25,200	Contractual Services
	Travel		15,000	44,000	29,000	-	88,000	Travel
	Publication		-	-	10,000	-	10,000	Supplies, Commodities and Materials
	Component 1 Total		116,390	146,244	91,679	-	354,313	
	National Technical	GGGI	18,262	28,158	33,680	-	80,099	Staff & Personnel (including Consultant)

Page 109 of 156 1 of 43154 words English (United States) Text Predictions: On Accessibility: Investigate Focus 11:03 AM 5/9/2025

1. Thanks for the suggestion. Basis discussions with the government partner, leveraging the advantage of implementing CBIT projects in the region simultaneously, and given the scope / nature of these positions required for effective project delivery, we wish to maintain the current scope / budget as it is. Additional details have been provided in response to query no. 4.

2. N/A

3. Thanks for the suggestion. Travel has been budgeted only for activities which necessitate in-person participation including training workshops and knowledge sharing activities, data collection, consultation and validation workshops for various project deliverables. Considering the current internal capacities, the government has also highlighted the importance of in-person events for key activities. May kindly note that these interactions are over and above the virtual interactions. Further, as highlighted earlier and in the proposal, it may be please noted the experts have to travel from outside of Palau owing to the limited expertise in the country.

It may be noted that travel required to complete different deliverables has already been rationalized by combining travel with related deliverables. The following deliverables would involve travel: 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.2.3, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.5, 2.2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 3.1.5, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3. Further, as per the request, the breakdown of the travel cost is as follows:

Deliverable	Deliverable details	No. of person trips	Remarks (if any)	Total (USD)
1.1.3	Data Sharing Agreement for data providers for both GHG Inventory and NDC tracking	1	Travels for deliverable 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 have been combined with one for 1.1.3, given the complementary nature of the assignments.	7,000
1.1.4	Consultations and validation workshops	1		7,000
1.2.3	A training series on ETF/MRV in collaboration with existing partners and platforms	2	Travel planned for Deliverable 1.2.1 is combined with this travel.	14,000
1.3.2	Regional peer exchange workshop organized	2		15,000
1.3.3	Participation in training and knowledge sharing activities on ETF and climate change	6		45,000
2.1.1	Scoping paper on gases, sectors and availability of data for preparing GHG inventory	1	Travels envisioned for Deliverable 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 have been combined with the one for 2.1.1, considering its complementary nature of assignments to be undertaken by experts.	7,000
2.1.5	GHG inventory training workshops	2	Travel planned for 2.1.3 is combined with this travel for 2027.	14,000
2.2.3	Training workshops on QA/QC	2	Travel planned for 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are combined with the travels allocated for this deliverable, as it is envisioned that one expert will deliver these deliverables.	14,000

2.3.1	A scoping paper on IT-based GHG database management systems (DBMS), assessing the needs and scope for the system	1	Travels planned for 2.3.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 are combined into this travel since the plan is to engage one consulting firm to deliver these outputs.	7,000
2.3.5	Training program on GHG DBMS	1		7,000
3.1.5	Training workshops on IT-based NDC implementation tracking system	1		7,000
3.2.4	Training workshops on NDC implementation tracking including QA/QC	1	Travel for one NDC/MRV expert to deliver training on NDC implementing tracking and reporting.	7,000
3.3.3	Training workshops on climate support	1		6,757
PMC		3	Travel allocation for participation in inception workshop, project closure workshop and key project meetings.	19,500
			Total	177,257

The above details are summarized in terms of the travel type, below.

Type of travel	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	PMC	Total
Travel for data collection, consultations and validation of outputs	28,000 (4 person trips)	49,000 (7 person trips)	20,757 (3 person trips)	-NA-	97,757
Travel for P2P workshop and other capacity building workshops	60,000 (8 person trips)	-NA-	-NA-	-NA-	60,000
PMC (inception workshop, project closure workshop and key project meetings)	-NA-	-NA-	-NA-	19,500	19,500
Total	88,000	49,000	20,757	19,500	177,257

Further, as submitted in the previous round, due to limited travel options for travel from / to Palau, high travel cost is expected.

- As submitted earlier, the National Technical Coordinator (NTC) is a Palau-based position, whereas Chief Technical Expert (CTE) is a resource (international) spread across different CBIT projects which are being developed at the same time in the region, with UNEP as the IA. This unique arrangement has been proposed to leverage the advantage of implementing

these projects at the same time and concurrent learning opportunities across the projects. Further, CTE will provide technical oversight and quality assurance of deliverables and accountable for the work delivered by NTC. This arrangement also addresses the lack of limited expertise at the country's level while ensuring successful project delivery and capacity enhancement of national personnel. The ToRs of these two positions do not have any overlapping deliverables for which they are responsible for, although for a limited no. of deliverables both provide support for the completion of the deliverables. Given this, we wish to retain the existing positions as per the earlier design.

1

5. Thanks for the suggestion. Project Associate (Administration & Finance), similar to the CTE, is a shared resource across other CBIT projects in the region implemented by UNEP. To cater to the other requirements of the project management ? procurement, HR and legal requirements in compliance with GEF, UNEP and GGGI regulations, additional support is required. The corresponding ToR for this position has been revised and included in the ToR list - Project Compliance Officer. The budget line has also been revised accordingly.

Response: 16 April 2025

1. May please note the split-up of the staff costs (44%) distributed for a 4-year implementation period:

* Technical delivery: 34.5%

* Monitoring & evaluation: 2.5%

* PMC: 6.8%

May further note that the budget for full-time NTC (USD 201,758) which forms 34.4% of the total salary cost has been determined after discussion with the Government and in consideration of the prevailing market rate to attract suitable talent. Further, normally such expertise are received by engaging consultants, but because of the nature of the institutional arrangements, as GGGI's staff is involved in the technical delivery of the project, the associated cost towards this delivery is also budgeted under Staff cost (which corresponds to around 46% of the total staff costs). In consideration of the above submissions, we wish to maintain the current allocation for this category.

3. The high travel budget reflects the inherently expensive flight costs in the Pacific region, driven by limited airline options, long travel distances, and logistical challenges. For example, a round-trip flight between Palau and the nearby Philippines (approximately 2 hours) costs around USD 1,200, subject to fluctuations, while a flight between Palau and Fiji can cost approximately USD 4,500. Considering this, we wish to maintain the current allocation for this category.

4. The National Technical Coordinator (NTC) is a national full-time position based out of Palau. While the other two positions of Chief Technical Expert and the Project Manager are shared resources spread across different CBIT projects being developed concurrently. Further, the respective deliverables of these two positions are provided separately in the Annex to provide more clarity on the roles even though it is envisaged that the responsibilities of these two posts will be discharged by the same personnel.

5. The ?Project Management Support? cost is towards the supervision function provided by GGGI who will be managing the finances and procurement. This covers the costs of GGGI administration in overseeing the effective implementation of the project. The same explanation is included in the budget table in the proposal.

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 N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/28/2025: The PM recommends further processing of this project.

5/27/2025: Kindly address the comment from O&P related to the budget table and resubmit. Please ensure you upload the latest agency project document as a public document.

5/14/2025: Kindly removing highlights from the portal form and agency project document, so we can recommend the project for further processing.

4/22/2025: Please address the comments in the review, highlight them **in green** to ease the review process, and resubmit.

3/27/2025: Please address the comments in the review, highlight them **in yellow** to ease the review process, and resubmit.

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 3/27/2025

Additional Review (as necessary) 4/22/2025

Additional Review (as necessary) 5/14/2025

Additional Review (as necessary) 5/16/2025

Additional Review (as necessary) 7/28/2025