

Demonstration of a Caribbean Mechanism Toward Establishment of a SIDS-SIDS Green-Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10992

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Grenada)

Project Name

Demonstration of a Caribbean Mechanism Toward Establishment of a SIDS-SIDS Green-Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/14/2022

Review completed by PM

6/17/2022

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Not fully.

a. Please ensure there is adequate description throughout the project submission on how this particular initiative can assist with the improving the enabling environment for LDN and SLM in the Caribbean SIDS. Additional comments are below.

b. In general it is important to stress overall given the investment of GEF funds, one of the key purposes of the KM Hub should also be to ultimately facilitate SIDS in delivering GEBs i.e., extraction of knowledge and learning in a systematic manner to also deliver global environment benefits and maintain the health of the environment. This should be reflected throughout the project submission in the project description, incremental reasoning, scale up, private sector engagement in relation to green-blue business and ensuring sustainable business practices etc.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

- a. Contextual inclusions have been made in Sections 1 and 3 narratives have been further elaborated to make clear on how the project will improve the enabling environment for LDN and SLM.
- b. Following the response above, various sections have all been updated to better reflect how the project will enable SIDS deliver on GEBs. Section 6 on Global Environmental Benefits has been updated

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Please clarify the following:

- a. Component 1: Please specify the tangible results expected expected from outputs 1.1.2 (institutional cooperation agreements) and 1.1.3 (cooperation agreements)? What will the use of GEF funding?
- b. Component 3: Please consider other mechanisms that may lead to more sustained results or that may lead to institutionalization of the initiative. At the moment the outputs are to create products and attend various ?marketplace events?.
- c. From a general point of view, the GEF does not finance the participation to COPs .In addition as written Output 3.1.2 is not at output. What is the result expected and what is the added value?

Agency Response

5/4/2022

a. Under Component 1 Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 expected results have been better differentiated as (1) *Institutional Cooperation Agreements for operationalisation of the Hub* and (2) *SIDS Green-Blue Economy Knowledge Network Nodes* respectively. The narratives associated with these outputs now indicate more clearly the processes that will be funded by GEF resources.

b. Noted. Under Component 3, the institutional sustainability has been redefined in the context of the convening of a Green-Blue Solutions Marketplace Event and Replication Strategy is expected to maintain the profile of the hub and networking within an international setting.

c. Noted. The initial intention was that project stakeholders/beneficiaries would present lessons and best practice findings at COP side-events rather than within the 'political' segments of COPs. Output 3.1.2 is reconsidered and proposed as Green-Blue Solutions Marketplace Event and Replication Strategy that will deliver more tangible results for sustainability rather than attending COP-related events.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Cleared.

5/26/2022:

Please see follow up comments below:

UNIDO through the Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Centre and the Barbados LOOK Clean Tech Cluster: change 'Other?' to 'Donor agency?'.

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Yes.

-However during PPG please explore cash/grant co-financing options as well.

Agency Response

5/27/2022

Change made to ?Donor Agency?

5/4/2022

- Recommendation noted; this is under active exploration with the development banks and funding mechanisms. This will be finalized in the PPG phase.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Cleared.

5/24/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

Per the Programming of funds in Table D, this an LD project, not a MFA project. Please make the correction.

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

5/27/2022

Correction made to LD

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/17/2022:

The revised OFP letters have been submitted with the correct STAR allocations. The Barbados Letter is cleared. The Grenada LOE which is missing the set aside funding amount is cleared conditionally.

5/20/2022:

The revised OFP letters are to be submitted.

5/2/2022:

Please check the LD Focal Area allocation in the letter from Grenada as the figures do not align with what is in the project submission. The letter from Barbados would also have to be corrected.

Agency Response

27/5/2022

The revised OFP letters are being submitted.

5/4/2022

These letters are being rectified and will be resubmitted when available.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Please specify the different categories of beneficiaries.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

The categories of beneficiaries have been specified in Table F.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Yes. However it may be useful to add focal areas Chemicals Waste and International Waters given the ultimate cross sectoral nature of the hub.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

Agreed; these focal areas and the relevant thematics have now been included in Table G.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

a. It would be good to include in the narrative the anthropogenic threats/causes as well. Given the focus of the KM hub on among other things to improve knowledge and

learning that eventually reaches policy makers and decision makers, bringing in human induced causes and drivers of the environmental problems would be necessary.

b. Noting that the planetary threats have been outlined, the issue of land degradation is lost in the paragraph on climate change. Please separate and provide further discussion on this environmental problem.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

a. The narrative under Section 1 has been expanded on the anthropogenic threats, causes and drivers. Captions within the narrative have been included to better reflect the context.

b. Noted. The discussion on land degradation has been separated and expanded under the Threats sub-section.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

-Important to highlight the newly launched GefIslands.org knowledge platform developed under the Communication, Coordination and Knowledge Management (CCKM) project, under the GEF funded Implementing Sustainable Low and Non-Chemical Development in Small Island Developing States (ISLANDS) Programme, GefIslands.org is intended to serve as a knowledge hub and repository for SIDS knowledge on chemicals and waste.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

- Noted. This opportunity for linkage to the Communication, Coordination and Knowledge Management (CCKM) Project under the GEF ISLANDS Project was already highlighted under the sub-section *Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects*. The narrative states that the project is expected to provide replicable models and approaches that may be emulated. The cross-linkages between this project and the GEF ISLANDS Project are also now inserted under Component 2 associated with Output 2.1.1.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Please see comments below.

a. For the Theory of Change, please include the barriers that the project is seeking to address so that it is clear which particular Output and Outcome is addressing a particular barrier. Please also include the Assumptions. This should all be included in the narrative on the ToC, which is currently limited and could be expanded.

b. Output 1.1.1 & 1.1.2- Please indicate the partners that will be targeted, naming the specific organizations? It is also noted that there is no mention of the other University of the West Indies campuses, even though this is a regional academic institution or other Universities within the Caribbean. This is necessary to secure early buy in and collaboration of this regional pilot initiative and use of set aside funds. Please clarify and include the role they will play here?

c. Output 2.1.1- *States 'Once the green-blue learning elements are extracted they will be tested and validated by their application to two pilot projects, one each in Barbados and Grenada, respectively. One such pilot could focus on a post-COVID-19 transformative approach to the use of nature-based approach to sustainable tourism development and/ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) and the utilization of sustainable technological options to small and medium sized enterprises. The methods and tools used in the pilots should have been applied in GEF projects implemented in CSIDS. An evaluation of the methodology will be carried out at a prescribed point in project implementation to fine-tune or adapt the approach with the publication of the final agreed methodology for extraction of learning elements'.*

Please clarify. If only lessons and approaches will be extracted from projects that have been assessed to provide good result, please clarify the purpose of the pilots? If the pilots are indeed to happen, we recommend that one of the pilots should be linked to the objective LD2-5 which has been selected by the project. Please also explore any KM methodologies around SLM/LDN that may be useful in this regard.

d. Output 2.1.2- *States 'The aim is to create curricula that is demand-driven with specific focus on relevance to rebuilding and recovery in the agriculture, tourism development, sustainable consumption and production, sustainable land management and urban development, ecosystem-based approaches for restoration, application of*

circular economy approaches around Green-Blue sustainable development recovery strategies in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic'.

This sentence is not clear. It should also stress the importance of green and blue recovery approaches that take into consideration potential GEBs for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, land rehabilitation, climate mitigation and adaptation and a pollution free environment. This links back to the threats outlined in the context and the purpose of having a systematic process of KM and Learning from GEF projects. Please include.

e. Component 3- Beyond a marketing and communications strategy, what plans will be put in place for a sufficient feedback loop to project developers, decision makers and national executing agencies on lessons and the suitable approaches of intervention in a GEF context as well as considering SIDS audiences beyond the Caribbean sub-region?

f. How will the Hub be made accessible to other potential users such as the private sector, scientists, NGOs etc to ensure there is a connection between the academic host and the other potential users on the ground?

g. How will the Hub incorporate or work with other regional and global SIDS relevant KM platforms coming out of GEF projects such as IW Learn and GEFIslands as well as those knowledge tools that are global in nature such as Trends Earth and WOCAT.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

a. The theory of change diagram has been modified to reflect the barriers that the project will address by component. A new narrative on the assumptions have now been added under Section 3.

b. Noted. Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 now reference the other academic and knowledge-based institutions in the region that will be collaborators and contributors under the project. The organizations are now also reflected in the stakeholders section along with anticipated roles. Securing commitments from other agencies is ongoing and will be updated in the PPG phase.

c. To clarify, the pilots are actually under Output 2.1.3 whereas 2.1.1 is the methodological output for how projects are screened for curricula development opportunities. The suggestion is noted and agree that one of the pilots be linked to the objective LD2-5; this now made specific in the text. The PPG phase will assist to identify potential opportunities. Associated with a possible SLM-oriented pilot initiative, it is made clear that KM methodologies will be integrated; mention is included of opportunities in respect to the land-coastal interface in the context of linked ?blue? opportunities.

d. The connection to the realization of global environmental benefits is now more prominently emphasized in Output 2.1.2 and language made clearer.

e. The preamble paragraph of Component 3 now states that appropriate feedback mechanisms will be established by the project proponents and partners. Related, Output 2.1.1 makes provision for evaluation of the methodology to fine-tune or adapt the approach for extraction of learning elements.

f. The Hub will be accessible through the IT solution that is Output 1.1.1. The narrative under that output is made clearer to offer the means via which the knowledge will be accessible to users/stakeholders as a web-based content management system/interface to online users.

g. The Hub will incorporate the work under other knowledge management platforms as relevant as the intention will not be to replicate existing efforts. The Hub will be designed such that reference pointers to relevant global resources will be built into the system. The degree to which global content is incorporated and how it will be done will be informed in the PPG phase. This is made clear in the component narratives and in the Innovation/Sustainability/Potential for Scaling up, Coordination, KM sections.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

See comment under Part I ? Project Information, Question 1.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

Noted; adjustments made, and recognition given to the complementarity to other GEF focal areas, specifically International Waters and Chemicals and Waste in updated narrative across the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

See comment under Part I ? Project Information, Question 1.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

The Incremental/additional cost reasoning section has been adjusted under the first section based on proposed recommendations to emphasize the overarching context of sustainable land management and land degradation neutrality as an underpinning connecting to interrelated environmental challenges in alignment with the GEF focal areas.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

a. It may be more accurate the state the project will facilitate countries being able to generate GEBs rather than the project contributing to GEBs, which implies this may be the case directly. In doing so, please indicate how the project will facilitate this.

b. Please consider other potential GEBs that could be realized in addition to those related to LD.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

a. Noted and suggestion adopted; change in the narrative is made in making clear how the project will enhance the ability of countries to generate GEBs.

b. Noted. The potential to generate GEBs in the context of other related GEF focal area strategies (Intl Waters and Chemicals & Waste) are now specified.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

-More detailed plans on sustainability of the KM Hub will be expected at PPG phase.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

-This is noted and has been emphasized in Section 7. The key feature to the sustainability model is that the University of the West Indies and other academic and KM-based institutions are anticipated to take up core roles in the KM aspects of upcoming GEF projects from the design phases. The precise modality will be detailed in the PPG phase.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?s/program?s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

-For consultation purposes and as potential clients/users of the hub we note that other stakeholders such as other universities in the region as well as UWI campuses, NGOs have not been included. Please clarify. This will also be important to ensure this is not a top down process.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

This recommendation is accepted and now a wider list of core stakeholders is included; the narratives across relevant sections of the PIF further now reflects this.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Cleared.

5/26/2022:

On the gender dimensions discussion in Section 3, the aspect of women's participation is elaborated. However, it is recommended that gender considerations are mainstreamed throughout the project. In this regard, please reflect in Components 1 and 2 how gender expertise and/or women's participation are taken into account. This is key to ensure that gender equality considerations are built in the planned outputs of the project.

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

5/27/2022

Recommendation noted. Under the narratives for Outputs 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 3.1.1, brief directives have been included to better ensure the project design takes into account gender equity considerations further the narrative under Section 3. In addition, the proposed indicator associated with Outcome 2.1 now adjusted to include *Gender-sensitive?* rating assessment/appraisal scores??

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

-The narrative around ensuring that private sector engagement through the KM Hub and the planned proposed *Private Sector Development Knowledge Programme and Transfer Partnership* also facilitates transfer of knowledge, technology and approaches that can facilitate increased innovation in a SIDS context around maintaining a healthy environment and delivery of GEBs.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

Noted. Key private sector bodies in Barbados and Grenada have been listed. These are now carried to the stakeholder table. The PPG phase will entail more detailed evaluation of more potential opportunities.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

a. The PSC could also include an organization which could bring a financial perspective as well- this could be the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund or a private sector representative.

b. We recommend to include representatives from other focal areas on the Scientific and Technical Knowledge Transfer Advisory Group (maybe from other SIDS KM platforms such as IW Learn) as well as the private sector.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

a. Noted. In further consultation with the lead UWI collaborator, the Caribbean Development Bank (as a CARICOM organization) is considered as a lead financial institution proposed to sit on the PSC. Other affiliated finance-oriented agencies such as the CBF and the CAF will likely join the Scientific and Technical Knowledge Transfer Advisory Group (ST-KTAG). The full complement of the PSC and ST-KTAG will be defined during the PPG phase.

b. Recommendation noted. Other affiliated agencies active in relevant KM platforms will indeed be invited to join the Scientific and Technical Knowledge Transfer Advisory Group (ST-KTAG). The proposed coordination and governance structures will need to be validated with stakeholders during the PPG phase.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/20/2022:

Cleared.

5/2/2022:

Beyond the national priorities for SIDS, given the regional nature of the investment with set aside funds, please also include in general how this initiative fulfills the priorities of SIDS.

Agency Response

5/4/2022

The narrative has been expanded to include strategic references to the wider SIDS priorities in the regional and international contexts considering the GEF focal area alignments.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/2/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/17/2022:

Revised OFP letters submitted. The Barbados letter is cleared. The Grenada LOE which is missing the set aside funding amount is cleared conditionally.

The project at CEO Approval/Endorsement, can only include Grenada if they provide a correct LOE during PPG and this means that the Set-Aside has to be included, in the LOE

6/13/2022:

Barbados letter received and cleared. Awaiting Grenada LOE.

5/26/2022:

On the letters of endorsement:

- a. The LoE from Grenada does not endorse the LD Global / Regional Set-aside for the GEF Project Financing + Fee neither for the PPG + Fee. A new LoE is required.
- b. The LoE from Barbados uses a different template ? the valid template includes one table for the Preparation grant, the GEF project funding and the associated Fee. As it is, this letter does not allocate funds to PPG + Fee. A new LoE is required if PPG + Fee is required from the LD Global / Regional set-aside.

5/20/2022:

OFP letter to be corrected.

5/2/2022:

Yes, however please see comments above on the Focal Area allocation from Grenada.

Agency Response

5/27/2022

The LOEs are being rectified based on the guidance. Will be uploaded once received.

5/4/2022

This is being rectified; document will be uploaded once received.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/17/2022:

All comments addressed. The Grenada LOE and the project is cleared on the condition that the project can only include Grenada if they provide the country provides the correct LOE during PPG, otherwise the project in it's current scope would not be approved.

The project can only include Grenada if they provide a correct LOE during PPG and this means that the Set-Aside has to be included, in the LOE.

6/13/2022:

All comments addressed. Grenada letter is outstanding.

5/26/2022:

Please address the follow up comments prior to CEO Endorsement.

5/10/2022:

The project is technically cleared, noting that the revised OFP letters from Grenada and Barbados are to be submitted prior to CEO Approval.

5/2/2022:

Not at this time, please address the comments above.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

During PPG phase please continue to consider the following:

- Please ensure that the revised LOE is received from Grenada.
- Include throughout the narrative a focus on improving knowledge management and sharing as a means to assist countries in delivering GEBs.
- Ensure the potential for synergies with the other GEF focal areas beyond Land, but including Biodiversity, Climate Change IW and CCM are defined, given the perspective that efforts that focus on land can deliver multiple benefits and can be seen as an integrator.
- Active stakeholder engagement to ensure early buy in from other Caribbean SIDS, SIDS from other regions and GEF OFPs and other academic institutions.
- Adequate mechanisms (with corresponding Outputs and Indicators) are in place to ensure sufficient feedback loop to project developers, decision makers and national executing agencies on lessons and the suitable approaches of intervention in a GEF context as well as considering SIDS audiences beyond the Caribbean sub-region.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	5/2/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/13/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval