



African Climate Risk Insurance Facility-Derisking Adaptation to Climate Change in Africa

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11008

Countries

Regional (Africa)

Project Name

African Climate Risk Insurance Facility-Derisking Adaptation to Climate Change in Africa

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

6/22/2023

Review completed by PM

12/18/2023

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

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

20Dec2023:

Addressed.

19Dec2023:

The project "Expected Completion Date" is still not corrected. Please correctly amend the completion date to be 56 months after the project start date of 5/1/2024, which would be 12/1/2029.

5Dec2023:

Please include Government as co-Executing partner type in the Information section of Portal.

Current expected implementation start and end date means 56 months of implementation, please correct the duration or the dates as needed.

28 November 2023:

Names of specific countries still do not appear at the top left of Part I: Project Information. Perhaps this is a glitch in the portal system, and if so we will check with the IT Portal team accordingly.

15 November 2023:

Please indicate the names of the countries at the top left of section "Part 1: Project Information". Currently, the indication for countries is only "Regional, Africa".

7 July 2023:

Please state the names of the focus countries in the relevant place at the top of the CER.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 : Names of focus countries indicated under Part 1: Project Information

AfDB: 17/11/23 : Names of countries were indicated in the final submission from ADRiFi

AfDB 14/12/2023: Government has been included as co-Executing partner type in the Information section of Portal and the duration of the implementation date has been modified (56 months).

AfDB 20Dec2023:

The project "Expected Completion Date" is now corrected. The completion date is 56 months after the project start date of 5/1/2024, which is 1/1/2029.

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) We note that component 1 and 2 activities targeting the private sector has been scaled back as a reflection of immature private sector insurance markets in the selected countries. Give this please explain how private sector engagement in the insurance market for climate adaptation and resilience will be addressed in this project and complementary projects. How will the immature private sector insurance markets in the 4 pilot countries be strengthened? For example, will this be addressed through counterpart funding through ACRIFA or other projects? How will this effect the outcomes and impacts of this project? We view private sector engagement in climate adaptation

oriented insurance markets as being a crucial element, so please explain and ensure how this is being advanced based on the country contexts.

B) Given the increased emphasis on institutional / soft setup of disaster risk financing and disaster risk management rather than investments, infrastructure, and equipment (component 3), how is this expected to effect the project outcomes and impacts?

C) In component 1, we note a weakening of specificity in the outputs with regards to climate hazards and impacts. For example the reference to social and financial impacts of climate hazards included in PIF output 1.1.1 is not in the CER outputs; and training on climate data collection, processing and climate risk modelling is removed (was output 1..3.1 in the PIF was removed in the CER). Please either build back in such references to focus on addressing climate change hazards and impacts, as well as outputs to address them such as trainings, or explain why all such references were removed and how they will be addressed through other outputs.

D) We note an significant increase in GEF finance for component 1 in the CER from the PIF (\$2,945,984 from \$869,319). Please explain why this is needed, and the impacts on funds taken away from other components, especially given that component 1 activities on private sector engagement have been scaled back.

E) Please explain why component 2.2 "Gender sensitive disaster risk financing strategies" that was in the PIF and is not in the CER.

F) Further to the comments above, please provide an explanation of the reasoning for all changes in outcomes and outputs from the PIF to the CER, including changes to the budget.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) The project preparation phase found that the private insurance markets in each of the four participating countries are insufficient to take on a role in the program. More thorough research is required to prepare for strengthening the private sectors, as the reasons for their low capacity are complex. On a global level, private re-insurance markets play a role through ARC insurance products.

B) Focus for this program was shifted to institutional / soft setup to better complement other programs such as ADRIFI and BREFONS, which provide infrastructure funding. The project preparation phase found that there are many issues which can be more cost-effectively solved through institutional approaches. The approach also strives to avoid overlap and duplication with existing programs.

C) Estimation of the potential gender disaggregated social and financial impacts of climate hazards added back in (Output 1.1.4). Training on climate data collection, processing and climate risk modelling added back in (Output 1.1.5).

D) Funding had to be re-arranged because co-financing sources in many cases are pre-allocated by recipient countries. Some activities, such as gender sensitive disaster risk financing strategies have been moved to component 1, and the funding for it has moved with it. The text in the report has been expanded upon to clarify this.

E) The output has been moved to Component 1

F) Changes from PIF stage have been more thoroughly documented in the report (Section 1a Changes in Project Design)

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) Please provide evidence (letters) for all sources of co-finance.

B) Please explain the changes in the sources and amounts of co-finance from the PIF to the CER.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) Evidence Letter for all sources of co-financing have been provided

B) Estimates made at the PIF stage were only preliminary estimates, and this was made before specific countries were selected. Co-financing reflects the availability of resources for these specific countries. Text has been updated to reflect this. (Section 1a Changes in Project Design)

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

7 July 2023:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

No, this is not provided in Annex C. Please do so.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Status of PPG provided.

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

18Dec2023:

Cleared

14Dec2023:

This has still not been addressed in the core indicators section for LDCF.

28 November 2023:

No core indicators are included for number of beneficiaries (core indicator 1) and area of land (core indicator 2).

15 November 2023:

No core indicators for LDCF are included in the CER. All are currently indicated as zero. Please see the core indicators section that is right after the Meta information.

7 July 2023:

No core indicators are provided in the CER. Please do so, preferably at the same or greater level as those in the PIF.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Please see:

1. F. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEF 7 CORE INDICATORS
2. G. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEF 7 CORE INDICATORS

AfAfDB: 17/11/23 : Core indicator MTR and TE values added

adAfDB: 16 Dec2023: Core indicator targets have been added for Core Indicator 1. For Core Indicator 2, following PPG related activities including consultations and analyses for the CEO Endorsement package, the targets for area of land managed for climate resilience is 0.

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) The climate change adaptation problems and root causes that will be addressed are not sufficiently defined. We note that minimal information on climate scenarios were provided in the CER for Comoros and South Sudan, but not for Djibouti and Somalia. Please provide information for all countries, at a greater extent than the minimal for Comoros and South Sudan. For example, two scenarios (optimistic and pessimistic, for example RCP 4.5 and 8.5 to 2050 if possible) on critical climate hazards and their impacts for each country would be useful. Without this, it is unclear what climate risks of impacts from hazards the project will be helping countries adapt to.

B) A lot of valuable information that was in the approved PIF was removed for the CER. Why? Please include all relevant information in the PIF in the CER, or explain why certain information is no longer relevant and therefore removed.

C) Please more fully explain how this project complements, advances, and is advanced by the broader AfDB climate risk insurance strategy. For example, how does ADRIFI and the GEF support for it advance and be advanced by ACRIFA? If the AfDB is pursuing GCF finance and private sector investors for agri/climate insurance through ACRIFA, how does this complement this project.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) Additional information added for all countries. (See sections under 1bi)

B) Hard to know without more precise information than this. Much has been added back from the PIF. Some language from the PIF has been updated because the Program design has been updated.

C) Private sector engagement clarified throughout the document. References to ACRIFA included. (See section 1.b.ii)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

Please ensure that all baseline projects are references and the baseline scenario is complete.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Baseline information has been added for the Horn of Africa as a region and each of the participating countries specifically. See section 1bii

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) Similar to other comments above, important information that was in the PIF for the Alternative Scenario is not in the CER. Please ensure all relevant information is in the CER, including what was in the PIF and is still relevant.

B) Please ensure an explanation of all outcomes and outputs in the alternative scenario section, across all 4 focus countries.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) Language from PIF restored. (Section 1biii)

B) Some clarifications added. (Section 1biii)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7 July 2023:

Yes

Agency Response

AfDB 13/10/23:

The proposed project and outcomes are aligned to the GEF focal areas, especially CC1 which is on ?Reducing Vulnerability and Increase Resilience through Innovation and Technology Transfer for Climate Change Adaptation?. See section V.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) Similar to comments above, please articulate the complementarity with ACRIFA and other elements of AFDB's agri-climate risk insurance strategy.

B) How will this project strengthen private sector engagement in the focus countries, in agri-climate insurance markets? Please ensure this is captures as business as usual vs value added.

C) We note the general statement that "Through the program, participating countries will have increased capacity for climate risk management and climate risk financing mechanisms." But how? Please be specific.

D) We also note the general statement that "GEF support will also be instrumental in strengthening the adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable and minimizing their exposure to climate risks, through community engagement and dissemination of information." Please indicate how, specifically.

E) Regarding the statement that, "In order to better inform contingency planning and further strengthen countries' participation in the ARC risk pool, quality and availability of climate data is paramount." But we also note that references to strengthening climate data that were in the articulation of outputs in the PIF are removed from the CER. Please explain or fix this.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) References to ACRIFA added

B) Role of private sector engagement clarified. Reasons for scaling down private sector elements of the program compared to the PIF have been elaborated further. (Section 1a)

C) Expanded explanation, (see section 1biii)

D) Expanded explanation, (see section 1bvi)

E) Program preparation phase revealed that many of the problems related to climate data availability were due to institutional challenges, not only infrastructure challenges. ACRIF will support the institutional part of the issues, while other programs such as ADRIFI support the infrastructure issues. Added explanation, see section 1a.

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

There has been no further or better elaboration of this from the PIF to the CER. Please do so.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Expanded section on adaptation benefits.

Please see:

- Section VI. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

A) On innovation, we note the statement that "4. **It goes beyond insurance by incorporating risk management strategies** and resilience-building measures and aims to reduce vulnerability and enhance adaptive capacity." But how, specifically? Please elaborate and point out what is innovative about specifically how it will build resilience measures and reduce vulnerability by enhancing adaptive capacity.

B) With regards to sustainability, how can this be the case with a reduction of the private sector engagement components. Please reconsider and explain.

C) Please provide a more thoughtful explanation of how this project will be scaled up. Is ACRIFA part of the scale up strategy, in partnership with the GCF and other investors, or otherwise? Please explain what the scale up strategy is and how it will work.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) Expanded to highlight other risk management strategies than parametric insurance. Section 1bviii.

B) Reference to private sector insurance markets and how they will be affected by the program added. Section 1bviii.

C) As a facility for the enhancement of insurance , ACRIFA will be mobilizing additional financing , especially for further development of the private sector. The work on setting the enabling environment under ACRIF will therefore make the participating countries eligible for upscaled financing in terms of enabling local private insurance to deploy climate insurance products for local smallholder farmers.

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

5 Dec 2023:

Cleared

November 2023:

The geo coordinates are still not appearing in Annex E. Perhaps this is glitch in the portal system, and we can liaise with the GEF IT Portal team.

15 November 2023:

We note the map that has been added.

However, we do not see the geocoordinates. Please indicate where these have been added, and kindly note the place to do so in Annex D.

7 July 2023:

Please provide a map that indicates all focus countries, and provide coordinates.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Please see:

- Section C) Project Map and Geographic-Coordinates

AfDB: 17/11/23 : The coordinate are at the bottom of the map in a tabular format and can be input into the GEF portal.

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

20Dec2023:

Addressed.

19Dec2023:

The comments have been addressed. However, the Stakeholder Engagement Table and Plan should be made more legible (yellow highlights with white text are very difficult to read).

5Dec2023:

Stakeholder Engagement: It is well noted that the project has responded to PM request for additional information on stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement plan. The information provide, however is very scant and still mentioned that the stakeholder analysis will take place during project implementation. The project should at this stage already had completed the analysis and lacks details on engagement with civil society and beneficiaries. The project should provide further details on its engagement strategy with these project stakeholders.

15 November 2023:

We note the information on the role of beneficiary countries' governments indicates the executing partners for Somalia and South Sudan are defined.

We also note that at the top of the CR in the project information, the Executing agency for Somalia will "be determined after inter-ministerial consultations" and for South Sudan is "to be determined (third party implementing agency)".

The executing partners must be determined prior to CER endorsement. Please define this in the CER.

This said, we also note the Executing partners for Somalia and South Sudan are indicated at the top of the CER document, in the project information section, as follows:

Somalia - Somalia Disaster Management Agency

South Sudan - Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management

We also note the letter from the OFP of Sudan indicates the Executing Agency in their country will be the Somalia Disaster Management Agency.

Please clarify.

7 July 2023:

A) Please elaborate on the general sentences on role of government. What Ministries and Agencies in which countries, and what roles will each have?

B) Please provide a detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase, as well as 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.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

A) Elaborated in the report. Section 1d.

B) The Section on stakeholder analysis and Table 8 was elaborated on the stakeholder engagement at project design as well as during project implementation.

AfDB: 17/11/23 : All these were clarified in the final submission from ADRiFi Coordination Unit.

AfDB: 14/12/2023 : The Stakeholder engagement section has been revised. Further details on the engagement strategy was provided along with the detailed list of relevant stakeholders.

AfDB 20Dec2023:

The Stakeholder Engagement Table and Plan have been made more legible.

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

14Dec2023:

Cleared

5Dec2023:

Gender: Please ensure that in Output 3.1.1 gender perspectives are incorporated in the training on adaptation and resilience. Please reflect how gender-specific results and Gender Action Plan are going to be reported on.

Agency Response

AfDB: 14/12/2023: Gender perspectives have been incorporated in Output 3.1.1 and text was added on how the Gender Action Plan will be reported on.

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

The articulation of what private sector actors will be engaged, how, and to what ends is limited in this section. Please note the comments above on the weakened focus on the private sector insurance actors and address this in the resubmission, including strengthening the articulation in this section.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

See other responses to private sector concerns above. Some additional text added on mapping and identification of private insurance markets.

The current state of private sector has been discussed throughout the CEO Endorsement Report. In addition to this, please See:

- Section D. Stakeholder Analysis (The role of the Private Sector)
- Section 3: Private Sector Engagement

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

Please consider adding a risk of inability to identify, engage and strengthen private sector actors on insurance.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Agency Response : Risk added. Please See Section 4.

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

28 November 2023:

Cleared

15 November 2023:

It seems the letter of support from the OFP of Comoros is missing. Please clarify.

It seems that Figure 1 in the "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination" section is missing. Please include this.

7 July 2023:

Please upload all OFP letters.

Please clarify if ACRIF the same as ACFIFA.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

OFP letters been uploaded. Distinction between ACRIF and ACRIFA made in the document.

AfDB: 17/11/23 :

OFP letter of support from Comoros was received and was uploaded.

It seems that Figure 1 in the "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination" section is missing. Please include this.

It seems figure 1 was not visible to technical reasons. It should now be visible.

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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

Please expand on this section, including how this project is relevant to the NDCs, NAPs (as relevant) and NAPAs of each focus country.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Section 6 has been expanded.

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

14Dec2023:

Cleared

5Dec2023:

The project proposal includes elements dedicated to KM&L deliverables (in all components) that enable and enhance access to knowledge and information through training programs, workshops as well as dissemination of knowledge and communication products for learning and awareness raising, including a micro-website and peer-learning platforms. The project will document and share best practices and lessons. While there is no reference to a communication strategy, dissemination and communication is integrated into project components. The project results framework includes KM&L deliverables. While the total budget for each component has been provided, there is no budget and timeline specified for key KM and communications activities.

Agency Response AfDB: 14/12/2023: A table with key KM&L activities, their budget and implementation plan has been added to the Knowledge Management section. Please note that these are only GEF funded activities.

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

7 July 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

7 July 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

15 November 2023:

Cleared

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

Please see Section 9: Benefits

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

14Dec2023:

Cleared

5 Dec 2023:

A) On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$21,351,965 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,065,982 instead of \$ 0 (which is 0%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

B) There is an increase of \$21,000 in project financing amount at CEO endorsement stage in comparison with PIF stage. Please confirm if this is a minor amendment and if it is, revised LOEs with new funding request should be submitted.

C) Budget table: Please request the Agency to include a budget table following the GEF template as per Guidelines on Project Cycle for further GEF review. The current budget table under Annex E is not the correct template. We will review per the resubmission and provide comments as appropriated

15 November 2023:

Please provide the budget within the CER in Annex E, using the standard GEF budget table.

7 July 2023:

Please provide a more detailed budget in annex #, by line item, as is the case with most projects.

Agency Response

AfDB: 13/10/23 :

More detailed budget added. Annex H.

AfDB: 14/12/2023:

A) The PMC has been modified to be more proportional and all necessary adjustments have been made into Table B and the total budget table in the portal.

B) Please consider that this is not a minor amendment. The corrected amounts had not been saved correctly on the portal and they have now been rectified.

C) The budget has been re-produced using the GEF template as per the guidelines on project cycle for further GEF review.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7 July 2023:

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18December 2023:

Recommended as fully cleared by the PM.

14 December 2023:

1 comment remains to be addressed, on LDCF indicators.

28 November 2023:

Technical cleared at this stage, pending further comments from PPO.

15 November 2023:

Comments remain which need to be addressed.

7 July 2023:

Several sections need to be completed and strengthened.

Agency Response

AfDB 13/10/23:

We have addressed comments and strengthened the document as required.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7 July 2023:

No comments were provided.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

STAP's substantive comments were not addressed. Please do so.

Agency Response AfDB: 13/10/23 : STAP's substantive comments have been addressed,
and comments and responses recorded in Annex B.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7 July 2023:

No comments were provided.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7 July 2023:

No comments were provided.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7 July 2023:

No comments were provided.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
15 November 2023:

Cleared

7 July 2023:

Please provide this information.

Agency Response

PPG approved at PIF: USD 200,000			
<i>Project preparation activities implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (USD)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted amount</i>	<i>Amount spent to date</i>	<i>Amount committed</i>
Consultants	140,000	98,000	42,000
Stakeholder Inception Workshop	30,000	31,420	0
Stakeholder Validation Workshop	30,000	28,580	0
Total	200,000	158,000	42,000

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5Dec2023:

Cleared

15 November 2023:

Please see comments above about geocoordinates.

7 July 2023:

Please complete.

Agency Response

AfDB 13/10/23:

This is completed. Please see Annex E:

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

20Dec2023:

Recommended for clearance.

19Dec2023:

Further comments remain to be addressed.

18Dec2023

Recommended as cleared by the PM, pending any final comments from policy alignment colleagues.

5Dec2023:

New comments on policy alignment.

28 November 2023:

Technically cleared, pending any further comments from PPO.

15 November 2023:

Comments remain that need to be addressed.

7 July 2023:

Several sections need to be strengthened and comments addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/7/2023	11/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/15/2023	12/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/29/2023	12/16/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/5/2023	12/20/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/14/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

