

Sustainable food systems and integrated land/seascape management in the Marshall Islands

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10862

Countries

Marshall Islands

Project Name

Sustainable food systems and integrated land/seascape management in the Marshall Islands

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/8/2022

Review completed by PM

3/21/2023

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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
3/21/2022:

The project duration has been adjusted by GEF SEC.

1/7/2023:

-We note and welcome the consideration for the development of an LDN framework through the project.

-However, for more improved alignment with the focal area objectives, and as indicated at PIF level, the project narrative needs to demonstrate a focus primarily on the delivery of GEBs with the improvement of food systems both as an entry point and co-benefit of mainstreaming biodiversity and agro-ecosystem practices into production landscapes/seascapes.

-There also needs to be a stronger underpinning of the Land Degradation Neutrality framework, beyond simply referring to the concept (as referenced in Table B).

-The project duration does not match the expected implementation/completion dates. Please correct where necessary. If the duration of the project is set to last 48 months then the completion date should be corrected to 06/30/2027.

Agency Response

6 April 2023 - Thank you for adjusting the project duration.

All comments are well noted. The project's description and narrative has been adjusted to reflect the delivery of GEBs as the primary focus of the project.

- The project narrative has been strengthened to place more focus on the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors involved in the food system and across landscape and seascape. Several Outputs and Results Framework indicators have been revised and rephrased to add clarity to how they will contribute to the delivery of GEBs while bringing about transformation in the food system.

- Outcome 1.1 indicators and targets in Table B and in Results Framework have been revised to include stronger underpinning of LDN and text revised in the proposed alternative scenario section to ensure stronger focus on integration of SLM and landscape/seascape approaches in the food system pathway and on how project activities will contribute to LDN beyond simply referring to 'featuring of the terms and concepts' of LDN in sectoral policies, strategies and action plans. In addition, a new Figure 4 has been added to the TOC section, depicting how the project design takes the key features and guiding principles of the LDN-SCF into consideration, and illustrates how the various outputs contribute to, or impact/drive the flow of, land-based natural capital and ecosystem-services in transforming the food system. The Outputs and Results Framework indicators have been revised accordingly, to focus more on how the outputs facilitate and support the adoption of SLM practices to avoid and reduce new land degradation and losses in ecosystem services, and implementation of restoration and rehabilitation measures to reverse past land degradation and losses in ecosystem services, as per the LDN response hierarchy of avoid > reduce > reverse, outlined in the LDN-SCF.

- The proposed project duration of 54 months comprise of an extra 6 months in the beginning plus 48 months of actual implementation. From experiences, it takes around 6 months to internalise projects and recruit the PMU before the actual implementation begins with the inception workshop. However, it is not possible to make this change in the portal.

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

3/21/2022:

Cleared.

1/7/2023:

- Component 1 is missing financing information for the GEF and for co-financing. Please include.

Given the response to question 1, please see comments below.

a) Outcome 1.1 -The project needs to go beyond simply ?including concepts of LDN?. How is the project incorporating the LDN framework and the principles or response hierarchy of avoid, reduce, reverse?

-Please review the phrasing of the Indicators etc. and determine and include how LDN can be integrated in plans around food systems and the Atolls Food Systems Pathway Integrated Action Plans (AFSP IAP). Please refer to the TPP guidance for how this should be done in the project.

b) Outcome 1.2: It is not clear how the listed outputs will lead to the intended Outcome. In addition, the Indicators as listed are solely related to increases in food production levels. The outputs and indicators as written appear to have no connection to spatial planning, regulation or decision making around integrating or mainstreaming biodiversity or integrating agro-ecosystem practices in the production landscape. Please revise so that there is better alignment between the Outcome, Outputs and Indicators, with the delivery of GEBs being the primary intent.

-Financing information for the GEF and for co-financing is missing. Please include

-Output 1.2.1- We recommend revising the focus of this output to be centred around training in mainstreaming biodiversity and agro-ecosystem approaches in food/productive landscape sectors. This would be more aligned to the GEF Focal Area objectives.

-Output 1.2.4- The GEF does not fund Food Safety.

c) Outcome 3: What is the added value of GEF's investment in this component? This is in particular related to Outputs 3.1.3: *Establish and strengthen, including training (both formal and informal), value-chains for local produce and local food products markets, including import substitutes* and 3.1.4: *Strategy for improvements of transport infrastructure and services for food systems*. The expectation is that Output 3.1.3 would focus on establishing, strengthening and training to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and

integration of agro-ecosystem practices in support of sustainable local value chains. The indicators should also be revised accordingly.

-In addition, for Output 3.1.4, the GEF does not fund transport infrastructure, so this should be excluded.

Agency Response

- Financing for component 1 has been adjusted.

a). As mentioned in response to 1, the indicators and targets for Outcome 1.1 have been revised and a new Figure 4 has been added to the TOC section, which illustrate how the project design takes the key features and guiding principles of the LDN-SCF into consideration and how the various outputs contribute to, or impact/drive the flow of, land-based natural capital and ecosystem-services in transforming the food system. The project document notes the concepts of LDN have not yet been introduced to the RMI national planning processes, primarily because the latest version of the RMI UNCCD National Action Plan was developed in 2012, which predates Rio+20 and adoption of SDG target 15.3 in the new Strategic Framework of the Convention. As such, Output 1.1.5 will introduce LDN concepts to policy formulation in RMI for the first time through the development of a LDN strategy and a LDN target setting program. It is proposed under Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 that the NFSP implementation framework and the AFSP-IAPs will ensure alignment with the LDN strategy to ensure will contribute to the locally-relevant LDN indicators and targets and that the activities either avoid and reduce new land degradation and losses in ES through SLM practices or reverse past land degradation and losses in ES through restorative and rehabilitation activities.

b). The Outputs and indicators under Outcome 1.2 have been revised and rephrased to add clarity to how they will contribute to the outcome and text in the alternative scenario section has also been revised accordingly to strengthen alignment and with delivery of GEBs as primary intent.

- Financing information has been re-entered.

- Output 1.2.1 has been rephrased and text revised in the alternative scenario section to strengthen alignment with the stated outcome. The AFSP program and the idea of a 'living national census' of food production was proposed by MNRC as this was already incorporated in the draft NFSP and was considered a contribution to addressing their weak capacity for extension services, with the hope that the AFSPs will lay the foundation for ongoing extension services beyond the lifetime of the project. Towards this end, the output has been revised to include a training of AFSPs as trainers on mainstreaming biodiversity and agro-ecosystem approaches in food/productive landscape sectors. Training on BD and ES-approaches is also incorporated in Output 1.2.2, which is specifically on training for enhancement of human resources capacity.

- Output 1.2.4. Noting the GEF does not fund Food Safety, the output has been rephrased and text revised in the alternative scenario section to place focus on ecosystem restorative measures to reverse losses in provisioning ES instead of on food safety. It has been revised as: ?Ecosystems restorative measures to reverse loss of ecosystem services from coastal land-based contaminants affecting food safety?.

c). Output 3.1.3 has been revised to place focus on training on agro-ecosystem management practices to support sustainability of local value-chains. It has been revised as: ?Training (both formal and informal) to support and strengthen the sustainability of value-chains for local produce and local food products markets, including import substitutes.?

- Output 3.1.4 has been removed.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

1/7/2023:

Yes.

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

3/21/2022:

Cleared.

PM also clears the budget allocation provided to the NPC and AFO given the technical tasks that will be undertaken and the absence of real cash co-finance for the project.

1/7/2023:

Not fully.

a) However the following activities are not eligible for GEF funding and so will need to be excluded from the budget:

-Food Safety

-EIAs

b) National Project Coordinator and Administration and Finance Officer are charged to project components and PMC. 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 \$393,250 of which 4.4 million are represented in grants. Please ask the Agency to revise

c) PMU internet and phone services and consumables should be charged to PMC but not to project components.

Agency Response

a) Food Safety and EIA have been removed from the budget.

b) The NPC and the AFO have tasks and responsibilities that contribute to the different components of the project, as indicated in their ToRs. Hence, their salaries are charged to the project components. The Government of Marshall Islands will provide in-kind co-financing to the PMC but cannot provide grant or cash to support the functioning of the PMC.

c) the PMU internet and phone services and consumables have been charged to the PMC

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

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

4/6/2023:

Cleared

3/21/2023:

Not fully. The portal entry for CI6 does not have the emissions avoided data disaggregated. It currently includes 34,808 CO₂e under direct emissions avoided. Please adjust to align with the text.

1/7/2023:

-The Data for Core Indicator 2 has not been completed in the portal entry. Core Indicator 5 may have been completed instead in error.

- Please disaggregate the emissions avoided data for direct and indirect. Please ensure this is also reflected in the project document.

- The team may consider indicating if any of the hectares recorded under ?Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity? and ?Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices? may be to some extent part of ?Marine OECMs supported? (indicator 5.3) or ?Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported?, and record these as appropriate under 5.3 and 4.5.

Agency Response

6 April 2023

Thank you for the observation. CI6 has been revised to show the disaggregated direct and direct emissions as 24863 CO₂e and 9945 CO₂e respectively.

- On CI 2- The GEF R2R Project and the Reimaanlok Framework, which RMI is a part of, includes the establishment of Marine Protected Areas. The GEF 7 project will provide the tools for strengthening HR capacity for management and enforcement of MPAs, through digital spatial planning at the Atolls level.

As indicated, Core Indicator 5 targets were estimated based on the approximate marine area in the six target Atolls that will benefit from reduced livestock effluent runoff, habitat rehabilitation, banning dredging and improved fisheries practices. This may include existing marine protected areas (MPAs) as part of the seascapes/ landscapes that the project will operate in. Details will be established through more consultations during implementation. CI 2 targets have not been clearly established yet. Site-specific environmental and social impact assessments and METT scorecards will be prepared for any MPAs that will be selected as part of the project sites.

- The notes for Table E noted total GHG mitigated is estimated at 34,808 tons CO₂e (24,863 tons direct and 9,945 tons indirect)

- OECM ? This is a critical suggestion. As in-depth community level consultations could not be undertaken due to COVID19 related restrictions, the actual area covered under the OECMs could not be established. In addition, the local resource management plans of the government which could form a baseline reference, were not yet completed. This will be established during the implementation phase and CI will be revised accordingly.

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes

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

3/21/2023:

Cleared.

1/7/2023:

In addition to the comments above on Table B.

a. Please clarify what Output 1.1.4 involves? The description is not clear. *Output 1.1.4: Enhanced policy, strategies/action plans, regulatory and incentive framework for environmental management, addressing flows of impacts among sectors (e.g. environment, agriculture, urban development, nutrition, waste management)*

b. Output 2.1.1 and 2.1.2- The GEF does not fund Environmental and Social Impact Assessments.

c. What are the tangible results and expected LD and BD GEBs from Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2?

d. It is noted that the following barrier was outlined, however it is not clear how this is being addressed.

One of the key reasons why agricultural extension systems have not succeeded, as mentioned above, is the very limited human resources capacity in agricultural extension services and the Agriculture Division of MNRC has no permanent presence in the outer Atolls. Another very important hurdle is the lack of quality data and information to improve knowledge and support decision making....

Agency Response

a. Output 1.1.4 has been revised and rephrased to add clarity. It has been rephrased as: ?Review and update of sector policies, strategies/action plans, and regulatory framework to ensure coherence with the NFSP?.

b. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessments have been deleted from Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

c. New paragraphs have been added to Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 to outline how the proposed Outputs support and provide incentives for the adoption of SLM, ecosystem restoration and sustainable harvesting practices to avoid/reduce land degradation and losses to BD and ES.

d. The identified barrier of limited capacity for extension services and MNRC Agriculture Division has no presence in outer atolls will be addressed under Output 1.2.1. A paragraph has been added in this regard, noting the AFSOs will be trained as trainers on agro-ecosystem management practices and SLM so they can have the capacity to act as Field Officers for the project and is envisaged that they will become part of the MNRC extension services beyond the life of the project. The primary roles of the AFSOs in project implementation will initially be on data recording and reporting towards addressing the hurdle of lack of quality data and information to improve knowledge and support decision making.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes, elements of the project are well aligned, however the narrative on other components related to food safety, health, nutrition are not as strongly aligned to the GEF FAs as these areas are mainly seen as co-benefits to a GEF investment. Additional suggestions were outlined above.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

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

N/A

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
3/21/2023:

Cleared

1/7/2023

-Stakeholder engagement matrix and budget table are off margin. Please adjust.

Agency Response The margins have been adjusted
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
21/3/2022:

Yes

1/7/2023:

There are opportunities to integrate considerations for more involvement of women in decision making as well as activities around value chains, target group for training etc. Please consider.

Agency Response

The role of women in decision-making, value chain activities, participation in training activities are incorporated into the gender action plan table under the section on gender analysis and action plan.

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

1/7/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

1/7/2023:

Yes.

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
1/7/2023:

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 CEO Endorsement Request
1/7/2023:

Yes.

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
1/7/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

1/7/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

No

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21/3/2023:

Cleared

1/7/2023:

Please clarify if the Project is targeting Core indicator 2 or 5?

Agency Response

The project will target primarily core indicator 5. The project will not be involved in the establishment of MPAs, rather guided by the types of PAs as per the LRMPs and Regulations of the Protected Areas Network (PAN) Act 2015. The project will build on and align with the Local Resources Management Plans (LRMP) for each Atoll developed under the Reimaanlok

Conservation framework, which identifies areas for MPAs categorized under four types of Protected Areas as defined under Regulations of the PAN Act of 2015: Type 1 ? Subsistence only, no commercial use; Type 2 ? high level protection, subject to no-take; Type 3 ? Restricted and Protected Area, total restrictions subject to no activities; Type 4 ? Traditional m?, managed and restricted by the Chiefs (Irooj).

During project design phase, some of the Atolls have not completed their LRMPs and it was not possible to carry our in-depth consultations with Atoll Local Resources Committees established under the LRMPs due to COVID19 travel restrictions so it was not possible to confirm areas where project activities will be implemented, guided by the above types of PAs. These are proposed to be carried out during the inception phase and form the basis of the work plans for the AFSP-IAPs and development of LRMPs.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/21/2023:

Cleared.

1/7/2023:

There has been no response to the following GEF Sec comments, please include.

1. Alignment with the LD focal area- we expect a stronger alignment and application of the LDN concept (including the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, reduce and reverse) and the LD focal area during the project design stage. Both need to be fully integrated into the project and central to achieving the goal/objective of the project along with mainstreaming biodiversity. We expect the narrative on both to be strengthened in the Theory of Change, Outcomes, Outputs and Results framework of the project, which currently still refer broadly to ?environment? and ?natural resources management? and ?food production? with only some mention of SLM, ecosystems and LDN.

2. Context- Please ensure additional and specific details as it relates to challenges of land degradation and biodiversity loss are provided. We recommend conducting an assessment of land degradation to inform the appropriate mix of SLM measures to be applied and we also recommend that RMI consider using this information from the assessment, to set LDN targets. Please refer to the UNCCD Checklist for Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes (LDN TPP) <https://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/land-degradation-neutrality/ldn-tools/checklist-land-degradation> and the STAP Guidelines for Land Degradation Neutrality- https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/2021-02/STAP%20LDN%20Guidelines%2016-pager%20web%20version%20%281%29_0.pdf. You may also refer to the UNCCD publication Land Degradation Neutrality in SIDS https://catalogue.unccd.int/1476_UNCCD_LDN_SIDS_technical_report-hires.pdf

Agency Response

1. The TOC, Outcome and Outputs and Results Framework have been revised and strengthened in terms of alignment and elaboration on the application of LDN in the project design focusing on integration of SLM and landscape/seascape approaches in the food system pathway. A new Figure has been added to the TOC depicting how the project design takes the key features and guiding principles of the LDN-SCF into consideration, and illustrates how the various outputs contribute to, or impact/drive the flow of, land-based natural capital and ecosystem-services in transforming the food system. The Outputs and Results Framework indicators have been revised accordingly, to focus more on how the outputs facilitate and support the adoption of SLM practices to avoid and reduce new land degradation and losses in ecosystem services, and implementation of restoration and rehabilitation measures to reverse past land degradation and losses in ecosystem services, as per the LDN response hierarchy of avoid > reduce > reverse, outlined in the LDN-SCF.

2. Additional details have been added to elaborate and provide more context in terms of the challenges of land degradation and biodiversity loss. A full assessment of land degradation is proposed to be carried out under Output 1.1.5 as one of the initial steps in the development of a LDN Strategy and target setting program. As mentioned in the project document, the LDN concepts have not yet been introduced in the RMI and the latest version of the RMI UNCCD National Action Plan is dated 2012, prior to the adoption of the SDGs and the new Convention Strategic Framework.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2023:

-The numbers do not appear to be changed in Annex C of the Portal Submission or the uploaded project document.

3/28/2023:

-We note that the numbers in the Status of Utilization of PPG still appear not to add up: if the budgeted PPG is 100k and \$37,541 has been spent to date, then the amount committed should be \$62,459 instead of \$48,622. Please revise.

1/7/2023:

Not fully.

The numbers don't seem to sum correctly. If the budgeted PPG is 100k and \$37,541 have been spent to date then the amount committed should be \$62,459. Please review and revise.

Agency Response

13 April 2023

The PPG utilization table has been adjusted in the portal, and in the revised project document (p 118) and uploaded.

6 April 2023

Thank you for the observation. The PPG utilization report has been adjusted.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/7/2023:

Yes.

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2023:

The project is not yet technically cleared. Please address the remaining comment on the PPG utilization.

3/28/2023:

The project is not yet technically cleared. Please address the remaining comments on Core Indicator 6 and the PPG utilization.

1/7/2023:

The project is not yet technically cleared. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/6/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations