



Conservation International GEF Small Grants Programme 2.0 (CI SGP 2.0)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11719

Countries

Global (Equatorial Guinea, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Sri Lanka, Libya, Turkmenistan)

Project Name

Conservation International GEF Small Grants Programme 2.0 (CI SGP 2.0)

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

9/20/2024

Review completed by PM

10/16/2024

Program Manager

Elsa Temm

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. The project meets criteria for GEF funding. It further aligns with the SGP 2.0 implementation arrangements and SGP Operational guidelines.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments below - all comments now cleared

GRT: 11/11/2024

Almost.

The project summary concisely describes the problems to be addressed and contributions to GEBs. Please, however,

a) The project summary is around 500 words and please try to limit to 250 words

b) Make a reference to the project's alignment and adherence to the Operational Guidelines for the SGP 2.0 in GEF-8 and the Results Framework and collaboration arrangements (co management of Sri Lanka) as well as the specific GEB outcomes expected.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

a) The project summary has now been reduced to 277 words in the portal section Part II. Project Justification Project Summary, and in the PIF attached.

b) A paragraph has been added that refers to these in the project summary; as well in the portal section B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION Project Description in the description of component 1; and in the section on Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities, in the portal section Part II. Project Justification. C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES These changes were made as well in the PIF document.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments below - all comments now cleared

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost.

a)

- The indicate project overview is a somewhat copy/paste of the project summary and does not provide a concise project objective. (the objective is stated later as: "The project?s main objective is to support and foster the active leadership of Indigenous People (where applicable) and local communities in addressing critical environmental problems and improving their livelihoods in innovative, sustainable, and practical ways through a nature-based and socially inclusive grantmaking approach, and to contribute to the overall achievement of Global Environmental Benefits and poverty reduction"). Please try to provide the project objective in a more concise manner upfront.

- The project provides clear objectives, components, outcomes, and outputs. Taking note that CI/CEPF work has focused on biodiversity hotspots in Equatorial Guinea, and SVG in the past, please, however, clarify why output 1.1.2 focuses only on NBSAPs and not including NDCs,

NAPAs etc. Noting also that the project will consider other priorities including: (i) community-based management of threatened ecosystems and species; (ii) sustainable agriculture and fisheries, and food security; and (iii) low-carbon energy access and co-benefits.

b)

- Please provide Name of the Protected Area, WDPA ID, and IUCN Category under core indicator 1.2 and 2.2
- Considering the subsequent ToC description and diagram, for clarity and consistency with the expected results, please ensure that the descriptions of the components etc. incorporate some specific linkages to the GEBs and the core indicators expected to be achieved with this project.
- Considering description in component 2 "Granting" that the project aims to dedicate 30% of grants to local communities (including Indigenous Peoples, as relevant in each country), 10-15% to women and girls, and 10-15% to youth, at the project level. Please clarify and provide some more details whether targets may differ between the five participating countries and how these targets will be determined as part of project development. Please also clarify the expected beneficiary CSO's that the remaining 40-50% of grant funding is expected to be delivered to.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

a)

? We have reformulated the indicative project summary for it to be more concise in the portal section Part I: Project Information B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY. As well this was changed in the project PIF document.

? Thank you for that suggestion, we have added , NDC, NAP and other relevant strategies and plans on the sections related to output 1.1.2. (In the portal section Part II. Project Justification B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION), and in the PIF document, including in the section Indicative Project Overview

b)

? We have specified underneath the core indicator table that ?the country program strategies will be developed under Output 1.1.2. Until this is done, it is not possible to know whether any protected areas will be targeted by GEF small grants. A full list of all protected areas in the target countries can be found in Annex C.? Please see Portal section Annex C.

? We have added these references to the description of component 1,please see the changes in the portal section Part II. Project Justification B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION, and in the PIF document.

We have clarified why there could be differences and that extensive consultations during PPG will help set targets.

We have added the specification in component 2 that "In addition to grants awarded to local and Indigenous communities, women's groups and youth groups, grant will be awarded to a range of other CSOs, including national, sub-national and grassroots NGOs, non-profit companies, and academic and research institutions." See this text added in the portal section Part II. Project Justification B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION, and in the PIF document.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes, gender dimensions, KM and M&E are sufficiently included and resourced. Please be advised that we expect a gender analysis and action plan to be developed prior to CEO Approval. Also, would be great to see some reference to communication efforts as part of the CEO approval.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

We will conduct a gender analysis and a Gender Action Plan will developed during project preparation phase, and it will be annexed to the CEO ER. The CEO ER will also explicitly describe relevant communication efforts to be undertaken in this area during the project

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comment below. The grant ratio is now set at 72%, meeting the requirements of the SGP 2.0 Policy/Implementation arrangements and new budget uploaded - comment is now cleared

GRT: 9/20/2024

Not yet.

Components are adequately financed, and PMC is within the 10% margin. However, the grants to CSOs/CBOs ratio is 70.89%. Please increase the ratio to at least 72% to meet the requirements of the SGP 2.0 Policy/Implementation arrangements.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

We have adjusted the amount for component 2 now, so that we reach the 72% target. Please refer to Indicative Project Overview in the portal and in the PIF Document in table on Pg5, and the new budget uploaded.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

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

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

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. Noting with appreciation also the reference to the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements and Operational Guidelines.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments above - comment now cleared

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. Please however see comment above on Project outcomes and core indicators.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

Suggestions on project outcomes and core indicators were addressed.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments below, including providing further details on the specific in country implementing/executing arrangements. Appreciate that more details on the country-level governance structures and national steering committee composition will be provided in the CEO ER.

All comments now cleared

GRT: 9/20/2024

Mostly. Please provide additional details on the below

a+b) Noting reference to national potential Executing Partners and national Executing Partner (RIT or other) and considering that the PIF only covers 5 countries, would welcome more precision/examples regarding statement that " in countries where a CEPF RIT is in place, these may be engaged as local Executing Agencies". Further information on assessments of possible national/regional executing arrangements will be required as part of CEO approval.

c) Please provide additional information on co-management arrangements with UNDP (1) in Sri Lanka, related to their GEF-7 SGP and SGP-8 core; and (2) in SVG with UNDP SGP-7 SGP.

In addition, as part of the development of the CEO Endorsement, please provide additional details on the country-level governance structures and national steering committee composition specifically, including efforts to safeguard a non-governmental majority membership of representatives from rights-holders, CSOs, CBOs, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities, Women and Youth groups and organizations, private sector and academia.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

a+b) we have added info on what organizations we expect to be the local executing agencies in each country in the section Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects. See this in the section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" in the portal and in the PIF document.

c) There will be no co-management of SGP GEF-8 core funds in either country. In Sri Lanka, CEPF and IUCN will coordinate with UNDP and the OFP to ensure that all GEF resources for the SGP are deployed in a coordinated manner, avoiding duplication and taking advantage of opportunities for synergy. In Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, CEPF will consult with UNDP and the OFP to ensure that lessons learned and, where appropriate, systems and structures from GEF-7 are built upon during GEF-8. These discussions will take place during project preparation phase.

More details on the the country-level governance structures and national steering committee composition specifically, including efforts to safeguard a non-governmental majority membership of representatives from rights-holders, CSOs, CBOs, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities, Women and Youth groups and organizations, private sector and academia will be provided in the CEO ER.

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments below, including difficulty generating accurate estimates at this stage. Expect that these estimates will be developed further at the ProDoc stage.

All comments cleared

GRT: 9/20/2024

Mostly

a) Welcome reference to the SGP 2.0 results framework and monitoring of financing to youth, women and IPLCs.

b) Please explain further statement "To generate estimates for the targets, the total impact by CEPF grantees against each indicator was divided by the total value of the global grant portfolio (USD 294 million) and then multiplied by the grant budget under the SGP project (USD 7.8 million)."

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024

a) we have included the reference to both the guidelines and the SGP 2.0 RF and monitoring of financing to youth, women and IPLC in the description underneath the Core Indicator table.

b) The country strategies for the SGP have not yet been prepared. Moreover, 60% of the projects countries were not part of GEF-7, so there is no existing strategy to use as a guide. Therefore, it is very difficult to generate accurate estimates for the contribution to each indicator that the project will make. These estimates will be developed further at the ProDoc stage, through consultation with the OFPs and other stakeholders in the project countries. For the purposes of the PIF, CEPF drew on more than two decades of experience with small grant making to civil society actors. CEPF monitors the contribution of its global grant portfolio to 17 global indicators, several of which are well aligned with the SGP indicators. For each indicator, the actual impact observed across the CEPF global portfolio from 2000 to 2023 was divided into the total value of the global grant portfolio (USD 294 million), to give a ratio of X impact per dollar. This ratio was then multiplied by the estimated value of the grant budget under the project (and discounted) to give an estimated impact under the project. At the time that this analysis was done, CEPF expected the grant budget to be USD 7.8 million. Based on the final list of countries that selected CI as the IA for SGP in GEF-8, the actual budget is USD 6.6 million (inclusive of cofinancing). It would be possible to update these targets to reflect the final figure but, as these figures are largely indicative and will be updated at the ProDoc stage, it does not seem worthwhile to do so.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

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

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for addressing the comments below. Stakeholder engagement risk now set at moderate, and comment is cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost.

It is noted that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and that CI attached its ESS Screening Form. However, the risk section in the Portal suggests an overall risk rating as substantial. Please make these risks ratings consistent and revise accordingly.

Related, it is also noted that stakeholder risk is set as substantial which is not necessarily consistent with the statement that "The project will be implemented in several countries where relations between stakeholders are influenced by the local context. Therefore, the risk of exclusion of some stakeholders, such as marginalised groups or vulnerable people, could be substantial. The risk will be mitigated by the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan that will be customized for each country of implementation". Please provide additional clarification and explanation

Moreover, considering that only five countries are involved in this project, some that CI has significant experience in, please provide further disaggregated information, and your planned measures to mitigate in these countries (i.e., considering targeted "Calls for Proposals", the role of the NSC, etc)

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

Information and explanation added in the portal section Key Risks and in the PIF document. Risks table has been revised. The overall risk is now moderate.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Please provide additional details on opportunities for SGP (in the five countries covered in this project) to contribute to improved alignment of national policies and policy coherence at CEO Approval stage.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost. In line with the larger vision of SGP, the project outlines opportunities for innovations and scaling up. However, additional elaboration on opportunities for SGP (in the five countries covered in this project) to contribute to improved alignment of national policies and policy coherence would be very welcome.

Agency's Comments

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. It is aligned with GEF-8 programming directions, the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8 as well as the accompanying operational guidelines for SGP in GEF-8.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Please provide additional details on the project's contribution to commitments of MEAs that GEF serve at CEO Approval stage.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. However, additional information on how SGP (in the countries covered in this project) are related to the implementation of commitments of MEAs that GEF serve would be welcome at CEO Approval.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

We will provide this information in the CEO ER.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

YES. With respect to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), the project is expected to make contributions towards achievement of targets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Comment addressed and now cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost. See comment below on stakeholder engagement.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

Comment addressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Comment addressed and now cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

No. Please provide information on key stakeholders consulted during PIF development as required per GEF policy, including their indicative roles in project components and outcomes and information on plans to develop a stakeholder engagement plan before CEO approval.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

Information on Stakeholder Engagement Plan added in the risks table in the portal, and in the PIF document. We have also included information on when stakeholder consultations took place, and with whom. Find this information in the portal section D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS, on the Stakeholder Engagement section. In the PIF document this was added under D. Policy Requirements/Stakeholder Engagements

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes. But it is noted that no request for PPG is requested. However, in several instances there are references to PPG stage. Assume that this means project development. If possible, just try to be consistent and use the right language.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

We have checked now throughout and harmonized to ?project preparation phase?. See these changes in the portal sections where there is the description of components 1 and 2, in the section Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects, and in the Core Indicators Description. These changes were made as well in the PIF document.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Thank you for the updates made in the portal - comment now cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost.

It is noted that the expected cofinancing amount is rather low considering that the CEPF is the accompanying delivery mechanism and that the cofinancing table only mentions recipient governments as cofinancing partners, and not CEPF and RITs, CSOs/CBOs, private partners etc.

Please provide further clarification, and considerations as part of the submission of the CEO approval. In addition, please provide the type of cofinancing for CI as source of cofinancing in the cofinancing table.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

In the portal sections Part I: Project Information: B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY; C. INDICATIVE SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING, we have updated the co-financing figures.

We have added the co-financing amounts anticipated by CEPF in the table, and have provided an explanation on this in the PIF document below the table of co-financing:

?These are anticipated amounts that CEPF will invest in grant-making to civil society groups in the same countries, following CEPF's own grant-making structures (i.e., in parallel to but separate from the SGP funding): Equatorial Guinea: \$500,000, Libya: \$500,000, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines: \$500,000, Sri Lanka: \$0, Turkmenistan: \$500,000?

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

New Equatorial Guinea LOI uploaded, and comment is cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

Almost.

- Turkmenistan LOI: ok
- Equatorial Guinea LOI: The LOI does not follow the SGP template. Please ask OFP to use the agreed template and re-attach
- Sri Lanka LOI: ok
- SVG LOI: ok
- Libya LOI :

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

Please see the new Equatorial Guinea LOI uploaded.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

see above

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2014

Thank you for these additional details and expect further precision at CEO approval stage if possible.

Comment cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

No. Please provide, if possible, some indication of the project's intended location.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF- November 06, 2024:

We have added the geographical coordinates of the five countries

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

Comment cleared.

GRT: 9/20/2024

YES. See also above comment on risk rating

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/20/2024

N/a

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 11/11/2024

All comments have been addressed and this project is recommended for technical clearance.

10/21/2024

Please respond/address above comments.

Agency's Comments

CI GEF ? November 06, 2024:

CI GEF has addressed all the comments.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/25/2024	11/6/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		