

# Integrated land management, restoration of degraded landscapes and natural capital assessment in the mountains of Papua New Guinea

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10580

**Countries**

Papua New Guinea

**Project Name**

Integrated land management, restoration of degraded landscapes and natural capital assessment in the mountains of Papua New Guinea

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

1/17/2022

**Review completed by PM**

3/18/2022

**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

5/15/2022:

Cleared.

3/24/2023:

Please see follow up comments below.

-On project information: the duration is incorrect and should be changed to 48 months if it means to be completed by the expected completion date (or to extend the Expected Completion Date).

-The amounts/ focal area in Table A (BD = \$1,045,411 / LD = \$2,466,689) do not match those in Table D (BD = \$1,320,153 / LD = \$1,192,047). Please amend.

2/8/2022

Yes

#### Agency Response

**04/27/2022:**

- The GEF CEO ER document states the project duration as 01/01/2023 ? 12/31/2027, which corresponds to the correct project duration of 5 years.
- Thank you for noting the mistake. We have corrected Table D to match with Table A.

#### 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

3/16/2022:

Cleared.

2/8/2022:

- Output 2.1.4. Stakeholders benefit from piloted sustainable financing mechanisms for LDN to incentivize land restoration includes a number of activities related to finance (public and private), certification, carbon projects. Please include indicators that can comprehensively measure the progress related to this output.

#### Agency Response

2/17/2022:

We have introduced a new indicator to measure progress towards the targets under sustainable financing for LDN. The indicator consists of two sub-indicators, one capturing the financial volume generated, the other capturing the number of beneficiaries: Indicator 2.1.6 ?Volume and outreach of sustainable financing mechanisms for LDN generated by the Project?:

- a) US\$ available for sustainable financing for LDN
- b) Number of private individuals and SMEs accessing sustainable financing for LDN

The change has been reflected throughout the documentation (GEF CEO ER, UNEP ProDoc, Gender Strategy & Action Plan).

**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

5/15/2022:

Cleared.

3/24/2022:

Please see follow up comments below:

- Department of National Planning and Monitoring: change 'Grant' to 'Public investment'.

- Oil Search Limited: Combine the 2 entries and report the total amount as 'In-kind' and 'Recurrent expenditures'.

3/16/2022:

Cleared.

2/8/2022

-We note that the project involves a significant number of activities, with notable expected GEBs. Is the 'investment mobilized' grant co-financing identified solely dedicated to this project?

## Agency Response

**04/27/2022:**

-We have changed the DNPM cofinancing from ?Grant? to ?Public investment? in the GEF CEO ER document (Part I.C). Obtaining an amended letter from DNPM was not possible due to the field engagement of the concerned officials in preparations for the 2022 general parliamentary elections in Papua New Guinea.

-We have combined the two entries as ?In-kind? and ?Recurrent expenditure? in the GEF CEO ER and the UNEP ProDoc (paragraph # 216, p. 113). Getting an updated cofinancing letter reflecting this change was not possible due to the recent merger of Oil Search Ltd. with Santos Ltd. However, Santos confirmed that the cofinancing letter issued earlier by Oil Search Ltd. would be honoured.

**2/27/2022:**

The PPG Phase ensured that investment mobilized cofinancing contributions are not ?double counted? towards more than one GEF project. Therefore, the PPG relinquished pursuing a cofinancing letter from the USAID PNG Biodiversity Programme implemented by Cardno, since they had been approached earlier for providing a cofinancing commitment to the GEF-10515 project. Both cofinanciers with investment mobilized commitments (DAL - US\$ 970,000: PIP Village Farmers Project; 1,175,000: capacity building for SMEs; 3,100,000: Agriculture Commercialization and Diversification Project; CEPA - US\$ 832,500 tree planting programme) have been approached to reconfirm exclusivity. And we have received confirmation from both CEPA and DAL that their commitments were solely made to the GEF-10580 project.

### **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

**5/15/2022:**

Adjustments have been made to the CTA allocation and the national executing agency (CEPA) has now absorbed various line items of PMC costs which will now be covered under co-financing.

**3/24/2022:**

- The cost for the National Project Manager and 2 Provincial Project Coordinators have been charged across the components, the M&E budget and the PMC, while the Chief Technical Advisor whose TOR indicates some project management functions has no costs charged to the PMC, but only to the components. Per GEF 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. Given that 84% of the total co-financing is attributed to 'grants' there should be an opportunity for more proportionality between the GEF share of these staff position costs and the co-financing share. Please reallocate

all the management costs associated with these positions to the PMC overall and where possible increase the co-financing share that will be used to cover these project management staff costs/functions.

-Office equipment stipulated below should be charged to PMC. Cost of fuel and vehicle maintenance should be preferably covered by the co-financing.

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

3/16/2022:

-PMC proportionality comment cleared.

-M&E Budget: Unfortunately the M&E budget in the portal under Section 9, still shows a total of \$175,000.

2/9/2022:

Not fully.

-Please ensure that there is more proportionality between the GEF's contribution to PMC and the co-financing contribution to PMC.

-The total cost for M&E in the uploaded budget (\$180,000) does not appear to align with what is included in the M&E section of the portal submission (\$175,000). Please clarify.

#### Agency Response

**04/27/2022:**

- We have charged 16.3% of the costs of the CTA to the PMC to account for her/his project management related tasks described in the ToR. CEPA as the Executing Agency made a serious attempt in exploring options to cofinance staff costs of PMU positions, however, according to current government rules this was not possible. In order to demonstrate CEPA's genuine interest in cofinancing the Project, all major expenses booked under PMC apart from staff costs (costs of annual financial audit by an independent third-party audit firm; internet, telecommunication and bank charges; as well as office supplies) are now covered by CEPA cofinancing. In order to further emphasize CEPA's commitment, CEPA also committed the substantial amount

dedicated for local transportation in the provinces (fuel, maintenance, vehicle hire) to be covered by CEPA cofinancing.

- As requested, office equipment is now entirely booked within the PMC. Additionally, the costs of fuel and vehicle maintenance (costs of local transportation in the two provinces) are now entirely covered by the co-financing.

3/17/2022

- M&E Budget: Correction was made on the portal with the correction costs of the MTR as US\$ 30,000, resulting in a total of M&E budget of US\$ 180,000.

2/17/2022:

-Please note that following the submission of the PPG documentation to the GEF Secretariat two changes to the cofinancing structure were made: 1) the cofinancing letter by DAL was revised, since some commitments stated in the cofinancing letter referred to periods outside the project duration. This reduced in-kind, recurrent co-financing from US\$ 2,850,000 to US\$ 1,000,000, and investment mobilized, grant co-financing from US\$ 7,245,000 to US\$ 5,245,000. 2) One further cofinancing letter by the PNGFA arrived, adding US\$ 483,000 in in-kind, recurrent cofinancing. As a result of these changes, the total amount of cofinancing decreased from US\$ 22,791,991 in the original submission to US\$ 19,424,991 in the current submission. This amount still securely fulfils the 1:5 minimal cofinancing ratio of GEF : cofinancing funds defined in the GEF Cofinancing Policy. Since these changes in cofinancing did not affect PMC contributions at US\$ 883,910, the proportionality of this figure within the cofinancing commitment increased from 3.87% to 4.76% and now virtually equals the 4.96% of the GEF fund.

-Thank you for noting the mistake. We have corrected the M&E section of the portal submission, with the correct costs of the MTR as US\$ 30,000, resulting in a total M&E budget of US\$180,000.

#### **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

2/8/2022

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

3/16/2022:

Cleared.

2/8/2022

Not fully.

-Please provide details on how all targets are being accounted.

- In addition, it is noted that Component 2- Output 2.1.2 refers to restoration of degraded forests through SFM and agroforestry?, however sub-indicator 3.2 has not been selected. Please clarify.

-Please also include a reasoning for the reduction of targets in the Changes to the PIF table.

-Please include a breakdown of the categories of beneficiaries.

-Noting that *Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated are those attributable to the long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, and catalytic action for replication*, it is not clear how this target will be delivered. Please indicate how the 7,024,789 emissions avoided (indirectly) are being accounted.

## Agency Response

17/2/2022:

-We have inserted instructions on the mode of accounting all targets as UNEP ProDoc Appendix 28 ?Tracking of logframe indicators? (p. 232).

-GEF Core Sub-indicator 3.2 ?Area of forest and forest-land restored? was indeed not selected neither during the PIF submission, nor this time as the areas targeted for community-based forest management and restoration were accounted towards Sub-indicator 4.1 ?Area of landscapes under improved mgmt. to benefit biodiversity?, whereas areas to be brought under agroforestry are accounted towards Sub-indicator 4.3 ?Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems?. Kindly refer to the table on page 8, GEF CEO ER document to see the accounting of different land-based interventions towards GEF Core Indicators and Sub-indicators.

-We have inserted in the GEF CEO ER document (Part II.1.a.6 GEBs, page 53) a new table with an overview of the changes in GEF Core Indicators against the PIF targets and a reasoning for each proposed change.



-The text and the tables following Table E of the submitted GEF CEO ER document (pp 7-9) and UNEP ProDoc paragraphs #90 and #91 including tables, provide substantial details on the beneficiaries (total number by sex group, population figures of the different project landscapes by sex group and number of households, number of beneficiaries belonging to various disadvantaged group categories, number of NGO beneficiaries, number of benefiting landowners by sex group, number of women to benefit from direct livelihood support interventions, number of SME beneficiaries, number of government staff beneficiaries by organization). A separate email communication with Asha Imani Bobb-Semple at the GEF Secretariat seeking clarification on the comment confirmed that this breakdown of beneficiaries was sufficient, and required no further action.

- Thank you for explaining the correct interpretation of indirect GHG emissions mitigated. Indeed, the correct figure for direct GHG emissions is 7,024,789 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, the calculation of which is submitted in UNEP ProDoc Appendix 24 (separately attached completed FAO Ex-Act tool), whereas explanatory notes on the calculations are available in UNEP ProDoc Appendix 17 (p. 218). The accounting of the direct GHG emissions mitigated is available in the newly prepared UNEP ProDoc Appendix 28 ?Tracking of logframe indicators?, p. 231. We did not perform any calculations for indirect GHG emissions, as data on the long-term outcomes resulting from the removal of barriers is not available. We have corrected the figure of direct GHG emissions throughout the PPG documentation (GEF CEO ER Table E, Part II.1.a.6 GEBs, Part VI Annex A Results framework, Annex F GEF Core Indicator worksheet; UNEP ProDoc para#112 GEBs, Appendix 4 Results framework).

## **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

5/15/2022:

CLeared.

2/8/2022

-Not fully

Please consider mentioning the actual environmental problems related to biodiversity loss, forest loss and land degradation at the beginning. We note elements are included under the baseline section. At the moment the narrative under *global environmental problems* would benefit from more information on the land degradation, forest loss and biodiversity loss evident in PNG as a whole as well as in the targeted landscape. This information will provide a useful basis for the project intervention and the targeted global environment benefits.

## Agency Response

04/27/2022:

We have addressed the comment above made on 2/8/2022, but neither has it been marked as cleared, nor has it been further commented. We presume that the comment may be cleared, kindly confirm.

2/18/2022:

Thank you for highlighting the need to provide more information on forest and biodiversity loss as well as land degradation in the section on the Global Environmental Problems. We have expanded the narrative (consistently in both the GEF CEO ER as well as the UNEP ProDoc) with additional information for all of PNG as well as a summary of relevant information on the project regions located in other sections of the narrative.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

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

3/16/2022:

Cleared.

2/8/2022

Yes the alternative scenario is logical and well thought out. We have a few comments below.

a) On NCA- Given the high value of some of the extractive commodities in PNG, the project makes the assumption that the NCA will result in a favourable view of conservation or other sustainable land use. How sure are the project proponents of this result? Have any preliminary analyses been conducted on this?

b) Output 2.1.4- How will the policy and governance arrangements around the offset mechanism be defined?

c) Activity 2.1.4.6 ? Certification ? STAP provided guidance on certification in GEF projects. Please include their recommendations in the design of this project.

d) Activity 3.1.3.4 ? Lending standards ? Project #9589 is working on lending standards for the Agricultural Bank of Panama and might have some helpful lessons.

## Agency Response

17/2/2022:

a) In PNG large extractive industries are undergoing change towards more sustainability, driven by two major factors: 1) Finance institutions require compliance with ESG standards, and 2) environmental and human rights consciousness of local communities has grown (largely due to the sad history of environmental conflicts (e.g. Bougainville civil war, Ok Tedi Mine), leading to more stringent environmental regulations. Currently, the permitting of large mines in the Sepik headwaters, and others are struggling due to successful resistance by local communities with increased consciousness of the values of an intact environment (see e.g.

<https://savethesepik.org/sepik-human-rights-complaint/>). Though this situation does not necessarily apply in the case of less damaging and smaller-scale extractive commodities and industries, and does not mean full awareness on natural capital values and even less knowledge about NCA, it builds a strong basis for the Project's theory of change. According to our knowledge, no studies comparing the values of extractive commodities with natural capital values have been performed in PNG.

b) The policy and governance arrangements for biodiversity offsetting in PNG are laid out in the ?Draft PNG National Biodiversity Offsets Policy Framework? that was prepared with support of the GEF-9536 ?Sustainable Financing of Papua New Guinea's Protected Area Network? project. The policy framework has not yet been approved, however is expected to be finalized by the time of project start. The framework stipulates the payment of financial liabilities for offsetting into an appropriately governed Biodiversity and Climate Trust Fund. Implementing entities will report regularly to the Trust Fund on management plans, management effectiveness and conservation and social outcomes. The Trust Fund will assess renewal of fixed term funding to the implementing entities based on performance. In addition, an Independent Review Panel, reporting to the Trustees, will be established to provide review and scrutiny of Board decisions. The Project intends to channel offsets into the above-described Biodiversity and Climate Trust Fund, as described under Activities 2.1.4.2 and 2.1.4.4 (UNEP ProDoc Section 3.3 ?Project Components and Expected Results?, p. 74.).

c) Thank you for highlighting the existence of the GEF STAP guidance for certification. We have amended the description of Activity 2.1.4.6 in the UNEP Project Document, including the recommendations of the GEF STAP guidance.

d) We have contacted the relevant person in charge of GEF project #9589 at the GEF Agency Latin American Development Bank, but have not yet been able to obtain the requested information. While we further follow up on this, we have made reference to the incorporation of relevant lessons learnt from GEF-9589 into the training on improved lending standards promoting LDN for financial institutions in the UNEP ProDoc (ProDoc 2.7 Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions, p. 53; 3.3 Project components and expected results, Activity 3.1.3.4: Train bank and financial institution members in improved lending standards incorporating NCA, p. 80).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

**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

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

**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

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

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

3/16/2022:

Cleared.

2/8/2022

Not fully, please see additional comments below.

a) However we note the following *UNEP will also provide technical and administrative backstopping (including project appraisal and legal agreement, procurement oversight of financial management), disburse GEF funds to the two Executing Agencies and review financial reports, will closely monitor project implementation (for example, through supervisory missions), ensure that strategic adaptive management is applied as needed, and will commission the mid-term and terminal evaluations.*

As procurement is an execution function, this role should not be included in UNEP's list of responsibilities.

b) Administration: Noting that the project will be engaged in a significant number of activities and noting that other projects in PNG have encountered challenges with ensuring good administration, how will UNEP with limited on-the-ground presence ensure good project administration and track the status of execution?

c) On coordination with other projects, in terms of the FAO Project *'Enabling sustainable production landscapes in Eastern Highlands and Western Highlands Provinces for Biodiversity, Human Livelihoods and Well-being'* we also recommend sharing lessons on building capacities of small farmer enterprises and value chains as this may be the real missing link for sustainable agriculture.

## Agency Response

2/16/2022:

a) Thank you for noting the inappropriate role assigned to UNEP. We have removed 'procurement' from the text passages listing UNEP's functions as GEF Agency in the GEF CEO ER document and the UNEP ProDoc.

b) As described in the project document, UNEP as the GEF agency, will be responsible for overall project supervision and oversight, by ensuring consistency with GEF and UNEP standards, policies, and procedures, and maintaining accountability towards the GEF through standardized reporting. The UNEP Task Manager as the first reporting supervisor will ensure the maintenance of operational standards. As part of this, UNEP will provide project management training at the start of the project, including financial management and involving in recruitment process of all key staff members. UNEP will have monthly execution meetings with EA and will also undertake mission to PNG

every six months to provide implementation oversight. We have added this statement to the UNEP ProDoc (paragraph # 187) and the GEF CEO ER (part II.1b.6 p 79).

c) Thank you for highlighting the importance of sharing lessons learnt on capacity building of small farmer enterprises and value chain development with the GEF-10515 project. We have inserted explicit reference to this type of exchange in relevant places of the PPG documentation (UNEP ProDoc Section 2.7 Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions, p. 52.; Activity 3.1.2.5, p. 78.; Activity 3.1.4.3, p. 79.; GEF CEO ER, part II.6 Institutional arrangements and coordination, p. 81.).

#### **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

2/8/2022

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

2/8/2022

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 CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

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

5/15/2022:

Cleared.

3/24/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

On the M&E Budget: the expense ?Cash advance request and details of anticipated disbursement? cannot be charged to the M&E budget ? please amend.

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response  
**04/27/2022:**

We have removed the expense ?Cash advance request and details of anticipated disbursement? from the M&E budget.

**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

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/9/2022:

See comments below.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/15/2022:

Cleared.

3/24/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

-Please provide the sub-core indicators values (ha) in the results framework (annex A) for indicator 4 in the core indicator table (Area of landscapes under improved practices).

2/8/2022

Please see comment above under Question 2- Table B.

Agency Response

**04/27/2022:**

-We have inserted the sub-indicators for GEF Core Indicator 4 as Indicators 3.a and 3.b in the results framework.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

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

5/125/2022:

Cleared.

3/24/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

- A line item is missing. Please provide the missing information related to the 25,000 not used under ?Personnel Component?.

2/8/2022

Yes

Agency Response

**04/27/2022:**

-We have inserted the missing information for the line item under the ?Personnel Component?.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/8/2022

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

5/15/2022:

All comments have been addressed. The project is cleared.

3/24/2022:

There are follow up comments to be addressed prior to CEO Endorsement.

3/18/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

3/16/2022:

Minor correction to be made on the M&E Budget prior to technical clearance.

2/9/2022:

-The project is not yet ready for technical clearance. Please address the comments above.

### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	2/9/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/16/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/18/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**3/24/2022**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**5/15/2022**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**