

Strengthening capacity for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Timor-Leste's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12361

Countries

Timor Leste

Project Name

Strengthening capacity for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Timor-Leste's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/2/2026

Review completed by PM**Program Manager**

Saba Kalam

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

6/9/2026

Cleared

6/2/2026

1. Please include the agency id.

2. The project sector has been mentioned as "AFOLU", Please make it Mixed & Others.

Agency's Comments

1. GEF Agency ID has now been included.

2. The project sector information has already been updated to ?Mixed & Others?.

2. Project Summary

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?

Secretariat's Comments

6/9/2026

Cleared

6/2/2026

1. Please briefly mention number of people to be trained (gender disaggregated).

Agency's Comments

1. Tentative number of people to be trained under the project has been added to the summary. All revisions are highlighted in yellow for ease of reference.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 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?

Secretariat's Comments

6/12/2026

Cleared

6/9/2026

1. M&E component lack outputs and outcomes - please amend.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)					
M&E	Technical Assistance		GET	69,234.00	16,996.00
Sub Total (\$)				1,848,768.00	453,842.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)					
				GET	101,232.00
				Sub Total(\$)	24,851.00

6/2/2026

Under outcome 1

- There is currently no dedicated output focused on enacting or revising legislation, decrees that would formalize institutional mandates for MRV and - ETF reporting. This could potentially undermine project efforts to ensure the consistency and reliability of climate data collection and reporting. Please consider including one output related to this aspect.
- While Output 1.2.1 touches on data provision and management, there is no explicit output on the design and operationalization of a comprehensive domestic MRV system.
- There is no output explicitly targeting the establishment or formalization of inter-ministerial coordination structures.

Agency's Comments

Response to 6/9/2026 Comments

1. M&E component has been updated accordingly to include output and outcome.

Response to 6/2/2026 Comments

- Output 1.1.3 has been broadened from a roadmap for BTR preparation to a roadmap for implementation and improvement of a national transparency system, providing the strategic framework for system development.
- Output 1.2.2 (new added output) focuses on the formalization and strengthening of institutional arrangements required for the functioning and sustainability of the system.
- Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.2.2, together with Output 1.2.1 support the design and operationalization of the national system.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. Gender aspects covered under component 1, Output 1.1.3. The project intends to incorporate considerations of gender equality and social inclusion throughout in the activities and results under component 1.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

- Cleared. PMC is 5.4%

- The overall cofinancing is nearly 25%, whereas the PMC cofinancing is only 10%. Please make it consistent.

- M&E is 3.7%

Agency's Comments

Co-financing details have been updated accordingly.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The current situation is clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective, providing a coherent and evidence-based narrative that links the country's underlying institutional, technical, and financial capacity constraints that impede its ability to fulfill its transparency obligations under the Paris Agreement.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The agency is requested to further elaborate the analysis of the need by filling up the need assessment **table at the PPG stage**.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gaps related to capacity identified in previous FSV/ICA/TER/ information sharing/exchange of views process of last 2-3 reports	Gaps identified during stakeholder consultation (Group or individual including requests from the Government on capacity required to comply with ETF)	Gaps addressed by activities of any other agency like ICAT/PATPA/etc.	Gaps to be addressed by CBIT Project	Map relevant output of CBIT proposal addressing the gaps (mentioned in column 4)
Institutional Coordination					
MRV/GHG Accounting					
MPGs/CRTs/CTFs					
NDCs					
FTC, Adaptation					
Other					

--	--	--	--	--	--

Agency's Comments

This is duly noted. The need assessment table will be further elaborated during the PPG stage.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The project has undertaken assessment with the ETFCAT tool that highlighted critical gaps and priority areas for strengthening transparency and reporting under the ETF for Timor-Leste.

The project is supported by a concise and coherent theory of change that articulates the causal pathways through which planned inputs are expected to generate targeted outputs, outcomes, and ultimately the desired impact.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The project will be executed by the Government and UNOPS. However, the IoE only mentions the Ministry as the EA.

The project has identified all relevant initiatives under Table 2. relevant to climate transparency in Timor-Leste, with their main objectives and linkages to the CBIT project.

Agency's Comments

5.4 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 indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. Yes, the core indicators identified in the project results framework are calculated in full conformity with the methodological guidance established under the GEF Results.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared.

During the PPG stage in the "Institutional and Policy Risk" , please include high turn over rate of trained staff and what mitigation measures project will undertake to ensure that the risk doesn't impact the overall delivery of BTRs in future.

Agency's Comments

This is duly noted. The ?institutional and policy risk? will be updated at the PPG submission.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside. The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The project demonstrates strong alignment with the country's reporting commitments under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, which establishes the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) requiring Parties to regularly submit national inventory reports and information necessary to track progress towards their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), support received and provided.

Agency's Comments

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's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. A comprehensive list of stakeholders consulted during the PIF development has been duly provided, reflecting a structured and inclusive consultative process undertaken by the Agency and the EA.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The proposed GEF financing, inclusive of the Agency fee, is fully in line with applicable GEF policies, guidelines, and established financial parameters. The total project financing requested from the GEF Trust Fund will be funded through CCM CBIT Set-Aside resources. The Agency fee, calculated in accordance with the GEF's standardized fee structure, falls within the permissible range as stipulated in GEF policy.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The total project financing requested from the GEF Trust Fund will be funded through CCM CBIT Set-Aside resources.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The total project financing requested from the GEF Trust Fund will be funded through CCM CBIT Set-Aside resources.

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. The PPG requested is within the allowable cap as established under GEF policies and guidelines for the relevant project category and grant size.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments
6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments
Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments
6/2/2026

Cleared. The project has been endorsed by Mr. Joao Carlos Soares, OFP since June 2012

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
6/2/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. Map included.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared. ESS document uploaded.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
6/2/2026

Cleared. Taxonomy sheet uploaded.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 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. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/2/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		