

Improving wetlands management for biodiversity and improved human-wildlife coexistence.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11435
Countries
Timor Leste
Project Name
Improving wetlands management for biodiversity and improved human-wildlife coexistence.
Agencies
CI
Date received by PM
2/7/2025
Review completed by PM
7/10/2025
Program Manager
Patricia Marcos Huidobro
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
FSP

PIF
CEO

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

5/5/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/5/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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 outcomes?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/30/25

Yes.

5/5/2025

No. Please focus on the global environmental benefits rather than crocodile related work. Crocodiles are not threatened. The idea of holistic, sustainable wetland management should be the focus. Crocodile work is a means to an end rather than the end in and of itself. Therefore, using new study methods wouldn't be something to include in the summary.

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

We have updated the text in the summary and throughout the document to place greater emphasis on sustainable wetland management rather than on human-crocodile conflict. However, it is important to point out that in Timor-Leste, effective wetland management must take into account the complex socio-ecological dynamics that characterize these ecosystems, particularly the persistent and sometimes fatal human-crocodile conflict. While crocodiles are not globally threatened, they are culturally significant and ecologically emblematic of the country's coastal wetland systems. Addressing human-crocodile conflict through community-based dialogue, awareness-raising, and spatial planning?including the development of a National Crocodile Management Plan?is not an end in itself, but a necessary means to enable more inclusive, sustainable, and secure wetland governance and management.

In Timor-Leste Southern coastal districts, where communities depend on wetlands for fishing, agriculture, and freshwater, reducing conflict enhances both human safety and community willingness to engage in conservation. This integrated approach helps safeguard biodiversity, reduce pressure on ecosystems, and strengthen the effectiveness of protected areas and broader wetlands management strategies.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- 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 budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/30/25

Yes.

5/10/2025

No. Please address the following -

- a. In line with the request to focus on GEBs, please remove "and foster human-crocodile coexistence"
- b.

Component 1 name - This seems like it's the goal of the whole project rather than one component. Can this be a bit more specific?

Component 3 - Please refocus on GEBs and not crocodile management.

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

a. Removed

b.?Component 1 name updated to ?Policy, planning and knowledge foundations for integrated wetland management?

Outcome 1.1 has been amended to Improved legal, institutional and knowledge frameworks to support integrated wetland management?

Component 3 description ? The focus of The Component 3 is now directed towards GEBs - sustainable wetland management and not crocodile. This includes the removal of training activities specific to crocodile management for institutional staff and the integration of a new output aimed at harmonizing sectoral policies to support improved wetland management -

Output 3.1.2.: Government-community dialogue platform for human-wildlife conflict resolution established, national crocodile management plan and wildlife monitoring system developed, approved by key stakeholders and implemented.

Indicators 3.1.2.a and 3.1.2.b have been updated

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

6/30/25

Yes.

5/13/2025

No. The final ProDoc reference a stakeholder engagement plan (annex H1), including information on stakeholder consultations in project development. Can't locate this annex and please provide the SEP as well as information on consultations with stakeholder in project development.

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

ANNEX H1 has been reuploaded, please check the annexes:

ANNEX F: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SCREEN AND RATING

Attach agency safeguard dashboard/assessment report(s), including ratings of risk types and overall project/program risk classification as well as any management plans or measures to address identified risks and impacts (as applicable).

Title	Module	Submitted	Actions
ANNEX H7 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - ProDoc - AGM_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
ANNEX H8 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - CHGSP_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
ANNEX H4 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - Process Framework_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
ANNEX H3 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - TPP_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
ANNEX H2 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - GMP_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
ANNEX H1 Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - ProDoc - ZEP_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
20220128 Second ESS Screening Report TL OncoodHe project_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		
Timor-Leste CH-GEF Project - ESS Screening Form_22	CEO Endorsement ESS		

Within it please see SECTION IV: Stakeholder Engagement During PPG phase

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 focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

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 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 FSP/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 design and 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

6/30/2015

Yes.

5/5/2025

a.

While there is a fine theory of change, there are important connections missing in the logic of the activities related to crocodiles as a means to or part of delivering GEBs. Please explain the logic or revise project activities.

b.

Component 1 - Will material support be provided to the communities and for the implementation of the management plants?

1.1.4 - As discussed during PIF review, first aid training should not be described as an incentive for conservation but rather as a part of a holistic solution/theory of change/approach for conservation. Please revise.

Component 2 - This seems to be the component actually focused on changing environmentally harmful behavior, which also is the source of some of the conflict. However, the resources and ambition of this component are quite limited.

2.1.3 - It seems a bit surprising that this is limited to youth - often defined as <18. We note that youth is also used to describe those attending school (3.1.2)

3.1.3 (para 139) - Crocodile reporting database - Given the prevalence of crocodiles, is the plan to have communities alert authorities for simple sightings of crocodiles? This seems like it would be overwhelming. Please clarify. In addition, we would encourage the project to seek out existing platforms that may be able to support these activities and provide long term financial sustainability. For example, iNaturalist could support the reporting of all sorts of species to add to knowledge of biodiversity more generally and might be appropriate for basic reporting. If this is not the plan, where will the platform be hosted and what is the plan for updating and maintenance after the project ends?

k. This project does not include discussion of policies that may be working at cross purposes to with the goals of the project. Policy coherence is not about whether a project aligns with national laws and plans (this is in the alignment section) but rather should focus on what policies or other conditions are in place that actively encourage environmentally destructive practices when considered holistically. We note that this project does not include a focus on integrated planning or policies to help shift the dynamics around wetlands and crocodiles. Was this considered? Are there opportunities for policies around agriculture or other production to be changed to discourage practices that are both environmentally harmful and serving as a driver of HCC?

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

a. The text of the 'Theory of Change' section has been updated to (1) clarify that the focus is on improving wetland management rather than solely on reducing human-crocodile conflict, and (2) highlight the critical need to address human-crocodile conflict as a means to enhance effective wetland management. See paragraphs 129 ? 141.

b. Under Component 1 it is expected to prepare management plans and provide capacity building to Community Conservation Groups (CCGs) to carry out conservation activities in the sucos, based on CCGs capacity building needs assessment. CCGs members will then be engaged in activities under Component 2 to promote alternative sustainable livelihoods as a means of supporting the implementation of the management plans and improving the natural resource management in the target wetlands.

Under Component 1, the project will develop site-specific management plans and deliver targeted capacity-building support to Community Conservation Groups (CCGs), based on a systematic assessment of their needs.

1.1.4 ? Output 1.1.4 had been updated. Any reference to ?incentive for conservation? has been removed

Component 2 ? Noted. Resources allocated to component 2 have been increased to support further, including additional budget for Community Grants.

2.1.3 ? According to the National Youth Policy (2016), youth start from 15 years old. That said, activities providing livelihoods support, such as Activity 2.1.3, will focus on youth that has reached the legal age for working in Timor-Leste, while activities related to education-sensitization activities, such as Activity 3.1.1, will interest youth at all stages, as well as younger students and local communities? members

The text has been revised to clarify that communities will report only in the event of crocodile-related incidents, rather than routine sightings. Crocodile community-based monitoring (CBM) will be conducted in collaboration with local communities and authorities, with a focus on identifying and mapping areas where incidents occur. The data collected both through spotlight surveys and CBM activities will support the preparation of wetland management plans.

Para 149-151

Thanks for the suggestion. Activities under Output 3.1.2 are now focused on the update of the information system created under the GEF-TLSNAP project and the use of existing platforms such as iNaturalist to support basic wildlife reporting will be explored. Para 214

k. Output 3.1.3 has been introduced ?Sectoral policy assessment for improved wetland management completed, with recommendations to ensure cross-sectoral harmonization?.

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

7/8/2025

Yes, this execution arrangement has been cleared by the Programs Manager.

The agency provided the following justification:

Conservation International Timor-Leste (CI-TL) is the first international conservation organization to actively initiate and implement efforts focused on improving wetland ecosystems within protected areas in Timor-Leste. CI-TL has played a key role in safeguarding some of the country's most vulnerable species, particularly waterbirds and critical habitats such as mangrove forests. The organization has supported the establishment of over 23 community-based Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and has collaborated closely with the Government to strengthen the management of three National Protected Area sites.

Through a co-execution approach, CI-TL aims to build institutional capacity within the government by jointly implementing conservation activities. While several other organizations such as TNC, WCS, FFI, Live and Learn are active in the region, none of them have permanent offices in Dili. CI-TL maintains ongoing collaborations with other conservation organizations (e.g., WWF, IUCN, UNEP), many of whom have approached CI to lead or support field-based conservation work.

In addition to CI-TL's technical strengths and local presence, it is important to highlight the institutional challenges within the Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) that make direct execution by Government challenging for a project of this scale and complexity. These include:

1. Limited Permanent Staffing in Key Environmental Agencies

Despite national efforts to strengthen the civil service, most government departments remain significantly understaffed. For instance, within the Department of Protected Areas, only two permanent civil servants are currently in place, while the majority are temporary or contract staff. These personnel often lack both the job security and institutional support needed to lead long-term, technically demanding initiatives. This situation has persisted for several years and remains one of the core constraints for direct project execution by government.

2. Technical Capacity Gaps in Conservation and Ecosystem Management

Many government staff assigned to environmental roles originate from academic or professional backgrounds unrelated to conservation, biology, or natural resource management. While development partners—including CI—have provided continuous capacity-building support over the past decade, these efforts have yet to overcome foundational gaps in specialized knowledge required for effective project execution, monitoring, and adaptive management in biodiversity and wetland ecosystems.

3. High Staff Turnover and Institutional Disruption

Frequent reshuffling of personnel—including from senior positions such as Director-General or department heads down to technical staff—has created institutional instability. These changes are often driven by broader political appointments or administrative restructuring, which disrupt program continuity and make it difficult to sustain long-term conservation strategies or maintain institutional memory within key agencies.

4. Policy and Priority Shifts Due to Political Cycles

With changes in government every five years, national development priorities often shift. In most cases, the focus has been on infrastructure, health, and education—which are understandably critical sectors—while environment and conservation receive comparatively lower budget allocations and policy attention. This has affected sustained investment in environmental program implementation, particularly in areas such as wetlands and protected areas, which are often considered lower-priority.

5. Weak Subnational Capacity and Limited Field Presence

At the municipal and protected area site level, government presence is minimal. In several legally designated protected areas, no dedicated government staff are posted on-site, and in cases where staff are present, they often lack training, operational resources, and transport to carry out even basic conservation activities. As such, the capacity to execute and report on a GEF-level intervention is extremely limited at the local level.

6. Lack of Demonstrated Models for Effective Protected Area Management

Although GoTL has invested in environmental governance structures, there is still a lack of successful, government-led models for protected area management in practice. Most functioning examples?particularly community-based marine and terrestrial protected areas?have been developed and supported through international NGO partnerships (e.g., with CI). Therefore, continued collaboration with technical partners remains essential to co-develop and demonstrate scalable, government-endorsed models that can be gradually institutionalized.

7. Risk of Mismanagement and Safeguard Gaps

Although relatively rare, cases of mismanagement of public funds in donor-supported projects have occurred in recent years. These underline the importance of strong fiduciary systems, procurement controls, and environmental/social safeguard frameworks, which international organizations like CI are required to maintain and regularly audit. Ensuring transparency and accountability is especially critical in the early phases of project execution.

5/10/2025

No.

b. As you know, we strongly discourage agency execution. Any request for agency execution is supposed to be cleared by GEF Secretariat prior to CEO Endorsement submission, noting how important executing arrangements are for project design. Please explain why CI needs to take this role and what other organizations were considered and why they were not selected.

c. This section appears to be missing. Please include this information in the CEO Endorsement document.

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

b. CI has an established presence in Timor-Leste, along with the technical expertise and systems required to ensure timely and effective implementation. CI-Timor-Leste and the government have a successful history of co-executing projects together and noting this requirement, the exception to the policy was sought at the concept and PIF stages. As a co-EA supporting the Government of Timor Leste, CI can reduce coordination bottlenecks, manage fiduciary responsibilities efficiently, and maintain the flexibility required to respond to implementation challenges, while keeping government stakeholders engaged in oversight and strategic decision-making.

This arrangement enables the government to focus on strategic leadership and policy alignment, while ensuring high-quality project delivery aligned with GEF standards. CI policy and practice maintains a clear segregation of duties between IA and EA functions and prevents any overlap for individual staff member functions.

c. A sub-section has already been included under the section ?Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?. For the information on Coordination with ongoing initiatives, please review sections in the portal and prodoc:

- A. PROJECT RATIONALE. See subsection Baseline Project, which contains information on GEF and other project initiatives.

- B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION. See subsection policy coherence

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome 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

5/30/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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 assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/30/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/30/25

Yes.

5/10/2025

No, please address issues raised above about biodiversity of global significance.

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

Addressed. Please see responses above.

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

5/10/2025

Yes.

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

5/10/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) 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

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response
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

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response
Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based

interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

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 RequestNA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/29/2025

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

5/29/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 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 total project financing (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

5/30/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/30/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 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

7/8/2025

Yes.

PM clears the request for vehicles.

5/30/2025

No.

1. Budget table:

1. A Technical Lead, a Finance Manager, Field Coordinators, and Field Assistants are being charged to both components and PMC. Administrative and management positions should usually be charged 100% to the GEF resources and co-financing resources allocated to PMC. Please revise the budget as appropriate.
2. Project satellite office rent and operating costs and Office expenses, internet, IT, utilities should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components. Please revise the budget.
3. There is proposed purchase of motorbikes and three cars from the project budget. Purchase of vehicles is strongly discouraged from GEF funding. Please explore co-financing sources for these items.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$Eq.)							Total (US\$Eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4 KM	Subtotal				
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1		M&E	PMC		
	Motorbikes	6,000	6,000	6,000		18,000			18,000	
	Laptops for Staff	5,625	5,625	5,625		16,875		5,625	22,500	
	Phones for Staff	900	900	900		2,700		900	3,600	
	DSLR Camera	1,000	1,000	1,000		3,000			3,000	
	Drone	5,000	2,500	2,500		10,000			10,000	
Equipment	Office equipment's and Furniture for Satellite Office					0		4,500	4,500	CI-Timor-Leste
	Crocodile spotlight tools (GPS Collar satellite tracking tools)			50,000		50,000			50,000	
	Equipment for crocodile training			20,000		20,000			20,000	
	Vehicles- Three Cars for Monitoring Area 1 and 2	37,000	37,000	37,000		111,000			111,000	
	Project satellite office asset maintenance	8,529	8,529	8,529		25,587		1,463	27,050	
	Equipment - Subtotal	64,054	61,554	131,554		257,162		12,488	269,650	

4. Office expenses ? internet, IT, Utilities (\$232,207) represents nearly 10% of GEF financing ? compared with similar projects, this looks expensive. Please revise.

5. The budget table in the CEO Endorsement request porta view is out of margins (see attached file and below) ? please ask the Agency to adjust.

Other Operating Cost	Communication Materials	8,612	8,612	8,612		25,836			25,836	CI-Timor-Leste
	Project satellite office rent and operating costs	3,770	3,770	3,770		11,310		3,770	15,080	
	Field supplies	1,730	1,730	1,730		5,190			5,190	
	Vehicle Insurance	800	800	800		2,400			2,400	
	Safety and first aid equipment	600	600	600		1,800			1,800	
		1,333	1,333	1,333		3,999			3,999	
	Office expenses, internet, IT, utilities	57,331	69,076	71,072	6,415	203,894	7,592	20,721	232,207	
	Other costs - Subtotal	74,176	85,921	87,917	6,415	254,429	7,592	24,491	286,512	
Grand Total		795,506	768,052	742,082	123,684	2,427,324	134,494	128,090	2,689,908	

Agency Response

CI-GEF June 27, 2025

1. For this size project the PMC is insufficient to cover costs outside of the items included in the GEF ?Project Management Costs (PMC) Summary? table under Annex J of the ProDoc . The co-financing is unable to directly cover these positions proportionally, but the co-financing does support PMC to the overall project at the same rate as the GEF funds. Moreover, the allocation across components reflects the nature of their responsibilities. Additional terms of reference have been added for all positions to clearly outline how they are directly delivering the activities they are charged to. The field coordinators and assistants bring to the project the local knowledge expertise to effectively engage in the communities they are working in and ensure that the project resources are directed to where they are most needed in the field. The Technical Lead integrates the data and feedback from the field to adapt and strategize in real time, ensuring coherence across components. The terms of reference for the technical lead and finance manager are written to showcase their contributions to both their management function and how they directly deliver project activities.

2. As noted above, PMC is insufficient to cover costs outside of the items included in the GEF ?PMC Summary? table. Project satellite office rent and operating costs and Office

expenses, internet, IT, utilities charged across components and PMC as they are necessary to effectively carry out the project activities. This is consistent with best practices in resource allocation as it is a calculable methodology tied personnel level of effort and direct use in the various technical and administrative aspects of the project.

3. This is well noted and alternatives to GEF funding were sought throughout the PPG, however no vehicles were found to be available for use for this project. We are kindly requesting the GEF to review the vehicle justification and consider an exception given the fundamental need for vehicles to access the remote and challenging terrains without delays. This is not simply a logistical preference but critical to project delivery. The vehicle justification shows the cost-effectiveness. Vehicles will only be used for project activities and CI-GEF will monitor use throughout the project.

4. See response to #2. As noted these costs are calculated based on an auditable methodology that ensures that only costs related to the project are included. The higher-than-average costs are the reality in Timor-Leste given the lack of a competitive market and infrastructure challenges. Import costs impact the price of energy, equipment and other basic utilities. Rent is also high in the capital city.

5. Budget has been uploaded based on the GEF requirements: in a word document, portrait mode, A4 size.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following 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 RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/8/2025

Yes.

5/30/2025

Not at this time. Please revise 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

CEO Approval **Response to Secretariat comments**
6/27/2025

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)