

# Towards Land Degradation Neutrality for Improved Equity, Sustainability, and Resilience

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10863

**Countries**

Cabo Verde

**Project Name**

Towards Land Degradation Neutrality for Improved Equity, Sustainability, and Resilience

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

12/9/2022

**Review completed by PM**

12/15/2022

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF** **CEO Endorsement**

### **Part I ? Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response  
**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

The changes with the PIF are explained and justified.

Addressed.

Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

The cofinancing ratio is not very high, with a ratio of of 1:3.44.

Addressed.

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Targets seem realistic.

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

The ToC helps to understand the reasoning and the logics. However, please, address the following comments:

- Wood energy is identified as a driver for land degradation in at least one of the landscapes: How will the project address this driver? Are there plans to collaboration with other sectors and national efforts on energy access. If not, we strongly recommend considering this suggestion.

## Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Thank you for the suggestion. During the PPG phase engaged stakeholder consultations, wood recovery for household use was not brought up as a major issue. The project focuses on production land and to a lesser extent on forested land, a choice that needed to be made considering the limited scope of the project in terms of time and budget.

However, from statistics and georeferenced data, wood remains an important energy source nationally, and its importance may grow considering the spiking gas prices. The project therefore has not overlooked the need to meaningfully include wood energy. Training curricula and outreach material can include wood energy and the impact on LD. Furthermore, the project created strategic linkages with the SGP and UNIDO implemented portfolio of work in the country, strongly focusing on renewable energy, and the water-energy nexus. Please, see the relevant language in the section on collaboration with other GEF projects and minor addition in output 1.2.2 description.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

## Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

The project document indicates that the LDN approach will be mainstreamed across different sectors including Tourism? Please indicate how this will happen with this particular sector? We also note that this Ministry is not a part of the LDN WG. How will they be involved?

## Agency Response

17 January 2023

The project design team agrees with the reviewer on the importance to include the Ministry of Tourism in the LDN Working Group in order to explore linkages and propose solutions in support of LDN. However, please do appreciate the focus of the project, which is not on tourism, as tourism is not a major sector in the selected watersheds, and oftentimes is small-scaled and rarely the main source of household income (B&B, eco-lodges). Nevertheless, an indirect linkage to this small-scaled, local tourism sector is made through the value chain component of the project. These prioritised value chains seek stable and competitive markets, found in the B&Bs and eco-lodges encountered in the project watersheds, as well as the school feeding programme. Therefore, the project will work collaboratively with entities such as the NGO Cooperativa PARES (aggregator of ag-food products to provision markets) and the private company Naturalissima (specialised in processing Santo Antao grown foods for Mindelo-city market) in order to gain lessons and train women and youth on affordable and profitable processing and packaging practices.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed

## Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed

## Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed

#### Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

#### **Sustainability:**

- Please provide concrete mechanisms for sustainability or that would facilitate continuity of project efforts. These relate to the following: How will the LDN Working Group be integrated into Cabo Verde's existing development planning systems? What are the plans to ensure that the group will remain active? Are there plans to integrate the SLM training activities in existing local training institutions? What are the plans to continue to provide incentives for small farmers to adopt SLM measures on the landscape? How will the data monitoring systems be sustained in terms of human resources and financial resources? Will these be anchored within the activities (and budget) of an existing Ministry or government agency?

#### Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

-Sustainability of the LDN Working Group: The revitalisation of the LDN Working Group entails a number of activities that are believed to contribute to its durability. Please, note that the LDN Working Group is not a mere revival of the group that was discontinued years ago. Indeed that group had a limited scope and once the results achieved, was discontinued. Instead, the revived LDN Working Group will have a broader scope and engage a larger group of actors. The objectives and TORs of the working group will be developed and agreed upon in a participatory way, and its structure formalised and institutionalised. A paragraph was added in the description of output 1.1.4 to clarify provisions to securing durability.

-LDN training integrated into local training institutes: Training is already delivered by MAA extension services, and SLM/LDN will be integrated into extension service training curricula.

-Incentives for smallholder investments into SLM: Please, do note that MAA has a suite of existing incentive mechanisms accessible to producers (e.g. drip irrigation incentive mechanisms), which include both credits and grants. The project can propose to update selection criteria for the awarding of incentives in order to facilitate the up- and out-scaling of NBS for LDN.

In addition, also municipalities have incentive mechanisms for smallholder investments into production and processing. Municipalities in the target landscapes have already confirmed interest to embed SLM/LDN into their incentive mechanisms.

-Data monitoring system: Based on lessons from previous investments, where decision-support tools have been developed by a contractor and delivered to the requesting Ministry at project closure, the LDN project has adopted another approach. The data monitoring system is being co-developed with relevant actors at different spatial scales, including the UNCCD focal point, DGASP, MAA delegations in the project landscapes, municipalities, and more (please note that the LDN WG will be the technical advisory of the LDN project, and therefore also inform on the data monitoring system). The co-development of the system is accompanied by a multi-year capacity development process, securing ownership of the system by end users. Furthermore, the co-developed system will link different spatial scales and address the data information and processing needs of actors at different levels. It is designed to serve the needs at these different actors at multiple scales (from local to national) beyond the project.

At project design, it is expected that DGASP will host the system, fully integrating it with existing systems in order to avoid multiplications and overlaps.

### **Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

- Please, describe the number of meetings set up during the PPG, with dates, number of participants, and main outcomes,

Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Please, note the detailed stakeholder engagement matrix in Annex H2 of the project document, which reports back on meetings held during PPG, dates, participating actors, main outcomes. It has been copied into the Portal section.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

We note the challenges related to gender and land tenure and resource rights and decision making:

- How will women be involved in more decision-making around LDN efforts?
- Apparently there is no women's group or agency representative in the list of organizations for the LDN working group. Please, correct.

### Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Please, allow us to clarify how women empowerment and gender mainstreaming will be part and parcel of the LDN Working Group efforts. Details are communicated in the Gender Action Plan.

- Women's voice and gender needs and gaps are integrated in the LDN coordination mechanism.
- Local women participate in equal proportion and conditions as men in the capacity building program on SLM to achieve LDN
- Provide gender equality sensitization training to key project stakeholders including policy makers and stakeholders for mainstreaming gender in project activities.
- Conduct gender responsive training and capacity building for the collection of gender specific data and use in the development of policies and guidelines to build national and local capacity in LDN projects
- Provide training targeted to women to strengthen their ability to take on leadership roles in negotiations and agreements regarding LDN Working Group.

The following institutes with gender mainstreaming related mandates are part of the LDN Working Group: Department of Gender, ICIEG (Cape Verde Institute for Gender Equality and Equity), and women's NGOs (TBD as there are many for each watershed).

Also local LDN working groups ? set up to inform the planning and management at the watershed level - involve local women associations. These associations have already been engaged in the consultations during the PPG phase, particularly in Val de Gar?a and Ribeira das Patas. The project has budgeted for training of these women associations, for them to become more empowered participants in the working groups.

### Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

The smallholder farmers, farmer associations, and cooperatives (PARES), are the main targeted stakeholders, as well as financing entities/lenders as OMCV. No other entities from the private sector seem to be involved. Please, confirm.

Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

The ones listed are indeed the main actors from the private sector. However, during the PPG phase, other potential private sector stakeholders were identified and the team will endeavour to integrate them in project implementation. These include Eco-lodges located in the watersheds, local guesthouses and bed & breakfasts. These can support value-chain development activities as they represent a potential market for the products. During field visits, some of these establishments were visited.

On the other hand, food processing and transformation centres ran by local women associations and the newly created enterprise Naturalissima are expected to play a key role during project implementation, as they collect fresh fruits and vegetables from farmers and transform these into juices, soups and more for local/national markets.

These elements have been added in the relevant section of the project document.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

- We recommend still maintaining risks and mitigation measures related to the COVID-19 pandemics. Please, complete.
- In some parts of the project, there are reference to risks that are not considered in the Chapter 5 on risks to achieving project objectives: national disasters, market volatility, access to finance and information. Please, correct.
- We are potentially seeing risks for the sustainability of the proposed mechanisms. Please, clarify, or include them in the risk analysis, with mitigation measures.

## Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

? Thank you for the comment. The COVID-19 risk measures had been taken out, as all restrictions on mobility were lifted in March 2022. However, we fully acknowledge the need to remain cautious and plan for new developments that can jeopardize project progress. Hence, a risk was added in the relevant section.

? The risk log has been updated to fully incorporate these risks mentioned, including natural disasters (under the umbrella of climate change) and market volatility. Please, note that the access to finance and information is a barrier and the project addresses this barrier through dedicated project outputs. It is therefore not treated as an external risk.

? Amendments have been made to the risk log in order to account for risks to sustainability.

## Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

- The governance structure of the project is comprehensive and inclusive in particular with the landscape level project engagement committees. Please clarify how these committees will operate? Will they be anchored to an existing

institutional mechanism that may be able to provide human resource support when needed?

- We note that Ministry of Agriculture and Environment (MAE) is jointly executing Project ID 9705 Managing Multiple Sector Threats on Marine Ecosystems to Achieve Sustainable Blue Growth which was CEO Endorsed in May 2020 and the GEF has not received any implementation reports. We recognize the challenges that may have existed in relation to COVID, however we would like to know what the plans in place are to ensure that there are sufficient human resource capacities within the Ministry to manage the backlog together with this new project.

#### Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

? The multi-actor landscape level committees will operate under the leadership of a local project management unit, as foreseen by the project. These local PMUs are hosted in the MAA delegations in the landscapes, and report to the MAA delegation and DGASP. The strengthened collaboration, engagement and ownership of these responsible actors is believed to contribute to the sustainability of the local committees.

Please, note that the project has foreseen the engagement of a number of dedicated experts, not yet MAA delegation/DGASP staff at present. However, these ad hoc recruited experts will be based in the MAA delegation offices and work closely with the teams, building capacity and securing ownership of project activities and results.

? Please, note that there are 2 provisions made in order to manage potential risks related to project execution: i) project execution partners are subjected to a micro HACT assessment during PPG identifying the potential risk areas for which risk mitigation actions are identified and budget for; and ii) the project grant foresees the part-time, full-time or ad hoc engagement of a number of project management unit members and technical experts. The project delivery will not entirely and uniquely rely on existing human resource capacity of the Ministry, but be complemented by a dedicated PMU, as outlined in the institutional arrangements section.

#### Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

A M&E plan is available.

- M&E budget is 10% of the GEF Project Financing ? per Guidelines, the recommended threshold for projects below 5 million is 5%. Part of the justification for a higher PMC is precisely to cover the costs of spot-checks. Please, revise.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget			
GEF M&E requirements	Responsible parties	Indicative costs (USD)	Time frame
Inception Workshops and Report (One in Santiago, and one in San Isidro)	Project Coordinator	7,000	Within 120 days from OED endorsement of the project
GEF Project Implementation Reports (PIR)	Project Coordinator/PAO	None	Annually (typically) between June-August
Monitoring of gender action plan	Gender Consultant	5,700	Ongoing/ cost of gender expert
Project Monitoring	MA&E, Expert Trainer	64,000 16,000	Ongoing/ cost of MA&E, expert
Monitoring of stakeholder engagement plan	Project Coordinator	None	Ongoing
Reports of Project Steering Committee Meetings	Project Coordinator	14,000	Annually
Progress reports	Project Coordinator LOV/SUN Expert OTA	8,640 2,800	Annually
Final Workshop	Project coordinator	7,000	
Independent Midterm Review (ITR) and management response	Independent evaluation consultants	40,000	Midterm point
Independent Terminal Evaluation (ITE) and management response	Independent evaluation consultants	40,000	Three to six months before project closure
Terminal Report	Project Coordinator	7,000	End of Project
<b>TOTAL Indicative COST</b>		<b>216,940</b>	

**Agency Response**

17 Jan 2023

The project budget is indeed very limited, and therefore the available amount for M&E too. A number of changes were made to the budget and the M&E section in order to reduce the cost of project monitoring and evaluation. Please, do note that spotchecks and audits are not part of the M&E exercise, as these are financial exercises part of the contract management with MAA, and costs are fully accounted for under PMC.

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

- The socioeconomic benefits are described, as well as the benefits in terms of resilience. However, could it be possible to include tools to quantify them, as tested in the GEF6 Resilient Food Systems with MPAT or RIMS?

Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Thank you for the suggestion. The design team shares the reviewer's view on the importance of proper quantification and monitoring of project results, including the socioeconomic co-benefits such as the food security and nutrition, women empowerment, women and youth employment, system resilience to drought and dry spells, and more. Note that the data monitoring tool already includes a limited number of socioeconomic georeferenced data (e.g. on wood consumption, migration, ?) based on census data or other statics that were made available. This tool can further integrate important georeferenced data, which can help with project monitoring and reporting, but also support informed decision making at the relevant spatial scale.

The project budget is limited, and therefore the project proposes to work with universities in Cabo Verde in order to deliver baseline and progress reports with support of MsC students.

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

Required annexes are available. Please, address the following comment:

Budget:

a. A Chief Technical Advisor is being charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$930,000, of which 3.4 million are represented in grants. Please, revise.



**ANNEX E: Project Budget Table**

Please attach a project budget table.

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Component 1		Component 2		Component 3		MSE	PMC	Total	Operational Partner Budget	FAO Support Activities	Total OPB	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
				1	2	3	4	5	6										
Technical Advisor	Days/line	100	300	14,000	5,000	10,000	20,000	20,000	5,000	5,000	2,800	30,800	30,800	30,800	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>				30,200	31,200	134,200	1,011,700	63,000	63,000	2,800,000	10,000	2,100,000	238,000	34,300	231,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000

b. A lumpsum for miscellaneous expenses is not an eligible expense for GEF resources. Please, provide additional details on that the \$19,925 USD will be used for.

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Miscellaneous expenses	Lump sum	1	19,925	3,500	3,500	7,000	3,500	3,500	7,000	3,500	3,500	19,925	19,925	19,925	19,925	19,925	19,925	19,925	19,925

c. Column ?Responsible Partner? is misses ? please ask the Agency to include it by filling out the responsible partner for each activity / expenditure.

**Agency Response**

17 Jan 2023

? Please, note that the Chief Technical Advisor has no project management related tasks or responsibilities, but is entirely and exclusively a technical input to the project. It is for this reason that the CTA is fully charged to technical components, to the same extent as the Nutrition and food systems experts are. However, please do note that the admin and financial manager is partially charged to project PMC and co-financing, as per GEF guidelines. This position will indeed be cost-shared. This is the case as well for a number of other ? technical ? members of the PMU. Details have been provided in the budget table.

? The General Operating Expenses have been eliminated and re-budgeted.

? Please, see per budget line, the responsible party, which is either the Operational Partner (MAA) or FAO. The relevant columns follow the Total column in the budget table.

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

- Please include the targets under the different core indicators in the result framework, with baseline data. Core indicators 3 and 11 are missing in the results framework. Core Indicators

targets need to be aligned with Results Framework and are required to be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.

## Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

The core indicators have been explicitly mentioned in the results matrix. Note, however, that the target for CI 11 is an aggregation of results achieved under different components.

## GEF Secretariat comments

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

### **December 15, 2022**

- We did not find the responses to comments made by the GEF Secretariat at PIF level in view of CEO endorsement. Please, find the comments below from the PIF review. Include your responses in a table, same way than Council members and STAP comments. See notably the comments related to the private sector, sustainability, and the definition of SLM.

- During the PPG, please identify the key aspects and priority actions into the Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan, the National Framework on Climate Services, and the Drought Emergency Plan.

- During the PPG, please, strengthen the incremental reasoning to well identify the added value of GEF financed activities in complement of cofinancing.

- Complete a gender analysis and the gender action plan.

- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis. Complete the risks related to COVID-19 (cf. GEF template).

- During the PPG, improve the level of information related to SLM financing (status, problems, options).

- During the PPG, confirm the innovation, sustainability, and scaling up aspects, especially: participatory learning and community stewardship, valorization of local knowledge, the use of multi-stakeholder platforms, mainstreaming of gender issues, sustainability of the watershed approach, national and local ownership...

- Improve the section on the private sector, detailing the role of SME and microfinancing institutions along the selected value chains.
- Confirm cofinancing, especially cofinancing from FAO, increase the level of cofinancing if possible.
- Confirm the targets under the different core indicators.
- Provide detailed maps of selected watersheds.
- Check the GEF portfolio in Cabo Verde for best practices and lessons. Check also the LD portfolio from other partners. Confirm the KM plan.

#### Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Please, see the answers provided in the relevant section. Apologies for the oversight.

#### **Council comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

#### Agency Response

**STAP comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

#### Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

Addressed.

**December 15, 2022**

The status of PPG utilization is available.

However, please, provide additional details on what each activity entails. As it stands, it's not possible to understand what (i.e. HR Inputs) any of the expenses include. Once resubmitted we will be able to review and confirm all GEF resources are used on eligible expenses.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Costs (PPG) by Activity, including amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: 100,000 USD GCP/CVU/051P/GFF			
PPG ACTIVITIES	BUDGETED AMOUNT (\$)	AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE (\$)	AMOUNT COMMITTED
HR INPUTS (PERSONNEL)	68,000	14,200	53,800
(S014) CONTRACTS	5,000	4,513	487
(S021) TRAVEL	19,000	18,733	168
(S023) TRAINING	8,000	8,099	
TOTAL	100,000	45,545	54,455

Agency Response

17 Jan 2023

Noted with thanks. The HR inputs cover the costs associated with hiring individual PPG consultants, while the contracts cover the costs to conduct the OPIM Capacity Assessment. The PPG document indicates the composition of the PPG team as follows: PPG Coordinator and Technical expert, Socio-environmental and gender expert, GEF Project Design Expert,

Value Chain Expert, Nutrition Expert and LDN/GIS Expert. Travels and Workshops refers to the costs associated with the Local Stakeholder Consultations and the Validation Workshops.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 15, 2022**

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2023**

All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for endorsement.

**December 22, 2022**

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above provided by the technical reviewers and the Quality Control.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/22/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/27/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**