

Building capacities in Burundi to implement the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10648

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Building capacities in Burundi to implement the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

8/17/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF's climate change strategy focal area element on the CBIT.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please change the wording on the project outcome for MRV from "monitoring" to "measurement".

3/16/2021: Comment cleared and additional changes below well noted.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

The wording on the project outcome for MRV has been changed from "monitoring" to "measurement" (p.1).

We have also taken the opportunity of this review sheet to update the CBIT Burundi PIF in line with the latest GEF guidance on M&E. As such, the M&E budget has been segregated as a separate line in Table B. The US\$ 45,000 budgeted for M&E include the costs of the Inception Workshop and the Terminal Evaluation, which were previously budgeted for under the different project Outputs. As a consequence, the amounts of GEF funds for Outputs 1, 2 and 3 in Table B have been adjusted (refer to yellow highlights in the PDF version of the PIF uploaded in the 'Documents' tab of the GEF Portal).

Note: all the edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated PDF version of the CBIT Burundi PIF uploaded on the GEF portal.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: If known at this time, please identify the ministry which is expected to provide the in-kind co-financing listed.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

Co-finance will be provided by the Ministry of Finance, Budget and Economic Planning, as now indicated in Table C (p. 2).

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: The resources requested are in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: At the time of this review, there are sufficient resources in the CBIT set-aside to support this project.

3/16/2021: At the time of this second review the original set aside allocation of \$55 million has been spent, but additional set-aside resources have been made available to support additional countries with CBIT.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: Yes, a PPG of \$50,000 is requested and it is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: Yes, a target for core indicator 11 is provided and explained.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/3/2020: The taxonomy is properly selected. However, please change the Rio Marker of mitigation to 2.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

The Rio Marker of mitigation has been changed to 2 in the Taxonomy sheet (p. 45). This has also been updated on the GEF Portal.

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: The environmental problem and some root causes are well described. Please provide additional information that summarizes key causes and barriers in relation to the CBIT and meeting the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework as well as

related issues in terms of institutional arrangements, existing capacities, etc. to carry out relevant activities.

3/16/2021: Cleared at this stage.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

A summary of key causes and barriers in relation to meeting the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework and related issues has been added under section 1) *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed* (p. 6-8).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: This section provides relevant information on baseline scenario and projects, as well as identified needs and gaps. Please address the following comments:

Please provide a description of the current institutional arrangements for climate change and the experience to date in preparing the national communications and the ongoing BUR project.

Please provide information on the status of the first BUR project under implementation as well as on the GCF readiness project referenced in this section.

Please also add the fourth national communication to the second table in this section and caption that table.

3/16/2021: Comments cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

A description of the current institutional arrangements for climate change, particularly for the preparation of National Communications and the BUR1 project, has been added, including a chart (p. 9-11).

The status of the BUR1 project under implementation has been updated, including an explanation on delays experienced (p.9). The status of the GCF readiness proposal has been updated in *?Table 2. Baseline Projects?* (p.19).

The Fourth National Communication and the completed TNA project have been added to *?Table 2. Baseline Projects?* (p.19).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please address the comments below:

1. We welcome the table highlighting the current/limiting behavior and the desired transformation. However, it is not fully clear how this aligns with the gaps, needs capacity constraints that have been outlined in the section above, how these are specific to Burundi, and how the activities under CBIT have been identified and prioritized. Please provide details so that the rationale of how the "prioritized activities" (such as developing an inventory of time series, survey of disaggregated data etc.) is clear and aligns with this table.

2. Output 1

- Clarify if this includes stakeholders as in ministries and government entities only or external stakeholders as well and if this includes a mapping of legal and regulatory frameworks as well (i.e. a mapping of both who and what as opposed to just who).

- Please clarify if this mapping exercise has been carried under the NC and BUR preparations., and whether recommendation on the necessary institutional arrangements have not been made before. Also comment on the envisaged arrangements and legal framework considering the national context.

- Regarding arrangements for NDC tracking, consider prioritizing sectors/activities per Burundi's NDC. For example, since the majority of Burundi's emissions are from energy and AFOLU sector, consider prioritizing these as a pilot. On adaptation, consider prioritizing the key adaptation sectors identified by the NDC and NAP.

3. Output 2

- The baseline scenario describes the needs for GHG inventory improvements such as issues with data collection and management for several sectors, inadequate data infrastructure, developing an inventory of time series etc. Describe how the activities in this output align with the identified needs and how they have been prioritized. Please also comment here on how these activities will build upon activities carried out under the BUR and how there will be synergies between this work and the national communication to begin soon.

- It is unclear how the technical working group to be formed under this output builds upon what has been used to date. The baseline scenario needs to be further clarified to understand the proposed set up.

- For training, we recommend considering options that have a longer-term impact such as Training of Trainers approach or collaboration with a local university. Consider resources such as the LDC Universities Consortium on Climate Change.

4. Output 3

- Please provide additional details on how this MRV system would respond to the existing NDC.
- Please clarify what is meant by "related initiatives" in this output.
- Please comment on how this output builds upon the BUR experience on reporting on mitigation actions and on the national communication experience in carrying out vulnerability assessments.
- Please clarify how the analysis in this output of current MRV practices and gaps differs from the analysis to be carried out under Output 1.
- Provide additional details on the existing information portal upon which this output would build as it was not described in the baseline scenario. Please also clarify the proposed NDC's portal purpose and what it aims to achieve. Describe how it would interact with any data management infrastructure that might exist for GHG inventories.

5. Output 4

- It may make sense to integrate Output 4 with Output 1 considering the focus on institutional arrangements and legal framework.
- Based on consultation with relevant line ministries apart from training consider other modes to build support for incorporating climate change goals such as an inter-ministerial group, etc. This would need to be conducted in alignment with the findings of Output 1.
- Climate change communication and awareness was described as a key gap, and raised as well in the gender analysis. Consider how the project can also contribute to that.

3/16/2021: Comments above have been incorporated and mostly addressed. See additional comments below:

The PIF has better identified how it will coordinate the work of this project with the outcomes and experiences of the first BUR and fourth NC. We expect the project to be well informed by these two reports in terms of the most immediate needs and gaps for technical and institutional capacity, which will likely become clearer during project preparation. However, we found the PIF still to be quite ambitious in terms of scope considering the baseline scenario.

Please consider further prioritization of deliverables considering the requirements of BTRs and flexibility provisions (while considering that Burundi is an LDC). For

example, the development of domestic emission factors can be resource and time intensive and not a necessary requirement, while there may be other aspects of GHG inventory preparation that is more urgent to further support. For example, data collection has been highlighted as a challenge by other countries. Likewise for the prioritized sectors for NDC tracking and adaptation, please consider defining their scope further as to what this will entail in practice.

Please consider adding a project activity/deliverable on the development of an improvement plan over time that can help the country address needs and gaps in stages (a longer term vision). This will help inform support from other sources or future CBIT support.

Please clarify what is envisioned under Output 1.4. How would climate change be integrated into development programmes--is this referring to climate change risks? Is it adopting tracking systems for activities that support mitigation and/or adaptation?

6/15/2021: Comments above have been addressed.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

1. *TABLE 3* on behavior change has been improved and detailed so as to align with the gaps, needs and capacity constraints identified for Burundi and indicate changes to be enabled by the prioritized activities (p. 21). Further details on the prioritization of activities have been included along the text on the 3 outputs (p. 21-26).

2. Output 1:

- A clarification has been added under output 1 to specify that not only government institutions but also CSOs, research institutions and private sector will be involved. Moreover, the text has been amended to include that the CBIT project will integrate previous stakeholders analysis under NCs and BUR1 as a starting point for the drafting of institutional arrangements, while making sure to consider the relevant stakeholders? current and potential involvement and responsibilities concerning climate transparency; to this end, CBIT may complement or further detail previous assessments if needed.

Moreover, CBIT will integrate results on mapping and analysis of the legal and regulatory frameworks as well as current MRV practices and gaps being carried out through the BUR1 project and may complement such assessment if needed, building upon previous and concurrent initiatives (p. 22-23).

- The text has been amended to clarify that the proposed CBIT project will draft and propose for adoption formal institutional arrangements and legal framework to collect and manage climate change data and information in the text in order to implement the action plan on a National MRV system to be delivered by the BUR1 project (not yet available as of mid-January 2021).

- Regarding arrangements for NDC tracking, a prioritization has been included as per Burundi's NDC: on Mitigation, the energy, transport and AFOLU sectors will be key; while for adaptation, the key sectors will be agriculture, energy, water, health and landscapes (including forests and biodiversity). (p. 22).

3. Output 2

- Output 2 description has been enhanced so as to outline how the potential activities align with the identified needs and how they have been prioritized; it has also been amended to comment on how these activities will build upon BUR1 and on with the Fourth National Communication to begin soon (p. 23-24).

- The existing technical working groups for BUR and NC will be reinforced under CBIT (p. 23). The baseline scenario section has been improved concerning their description (p. 10).

- A Training of Trainers approach will be further explored at PPG stage, as well cooperation with FAO for trainings focused on the AFOLU sector. In addition, the project will seek collaboration with the University of Burundi for the improvement of GHG inventories and training activities, as well as with the Least Developed Countries Universities Consortium on Climate Change (LUCCC) (p. 23).

4. Output 3

- Additional details have been provided on how the MRV system would respond to the existing NDC, and the current update process of the NDC (p. 24-25).

- The "related initiatives" mentioned in activities have been named in the text for this output, especially the BUR1, National Communications, NDC update and the elaboration of its National Adaptation Plan (p. 25-26).

- Further information has been provided on how this output builds upon the BUR experience on reporting on mitigation actions and on the national communication experience in carrying out vulnerability assessments (p. 25-26).

- The analysis of current MRV practices and gaps (formerly activity 3.1) has now been merged with the new activity 1.1 under Output 1 so as to integrate previous findings on the mapping and analysis of Measurement, Reporting and Verification practices and gaps, and complement the assessments produced under the BUR1 and NCs if needed (p. 23).

- Additional details on the OBPE website have been included in the baseline scenario (p. 12), and clarification on the proposed NDC National Transparency Portal provided under output 3 (purpose and interaction with data management infrastructure for GHG inventories) (p. 25).

5. Output 4

- Output 4 has been merged with Output 1 considering the focus on institutional arrangements and legal framework.

- Based on consultations with relevant ministries and the assessment under the BUR1 and output 1, different modes of building support for the incorporation of climate

change goals will be considered, such as the creation of an inter-ministerial group (p. 22).

- Climate change communication and awareness-raising have been further considered under output 3 description, which indicates that a Communication Plan will be considered at PPG, as well as interactions with the media to promote the website's visibility and the CBIT project activities (p. 25).

May 11, 2021

Activities have been amended for further prioritization, considering the requirements of BTRs and flexibility provisions, as follows:

Output 1

Activity 1.4: with a view to provide further clarification on what is envisioned, this activity has been reworded as "draft and propose for adoption a strengthened legal and regulatory framework that considers climate change risks and integrates the results of NDC tracking (mitigation and adaptation action, and related co-benefits in terms of SDGs) as key elements in the implementation and update of development programmes, based on results of the BUR1 project and NCs and informed by the National Development Plan of Burundi 2018-2027" (p. 23). This activity aims to improve the legal and regulatory framework so as to promote resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change, informed by guidance provided by the above-mentioned Plan, as detailed in the text (p. 23).

Output 2 (p. 23 and 24):

Activity 2.1: This new activity has been included under Output 2 to map activity data available, institutions involved, data needs and data gaps and propose an improvement plan over time for the national GHG inventory, according to the 2006 IPCC/latest Guidelines.

Activity 2.2: The improvement of data collection is now prioritized in the adaptation of tools and protocols to the national context in the GHG Inventory elaboration.

Activity 2.4: The development of domestic emission factors has been limited to the AFOLU sector in the PIF. Such need will be subject to further assessment at PPG stage, including the identification of key categories in the national GHG Inventory if appropriate.

Output 3 (p. 26 and 27):

Priority sectors to be tracked in the mitigation component of the NDC are now further specified: the hydroelectricity subsector in the Energy sector; and reforestation,

replacement of traditional charcoal kilns and traditional home ovens, replacement of mineral fertilizers with organic fertilizers in the AFOLU sector (p. 26).

Concerning the tracking of climate change impacts and adaptation, priority will be given to the following subsectors of the AFOLU, Water and Energy sectors: sustainable agriculture, water resources management, rational management of forest resources and hydroelectricity (p. 26). Activity 3.3 has been amended accordingly.

Note: for ease of reference, all edits made to the PIF following this review have been highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the PIF uploaded in the "Documents" section of the GEF Portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the CCM focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please strengthen this section with specific incremental reasoning for Burundi.

We also note that the cofinancing listed in this section does not match what is included in the project. Please revise.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

Section 5) *Incremental/additional cost reasoning* has been strengthened with specific information on Burundi and added value vis-?-vis the national communication and BUR1 projects. In addition, the co-finance amount has been corrected (p. 27).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please be more specific on how this project is innovative and will be sustainable.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

Section ?7) *Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up?* has been amended with specific information on the proposed CBIT project (p. 28-29).

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: This is a national capacity-building project.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please add research institutions and/or academia. Please also add the stakeholders identified in the gender equality and women's empowerment section (i.e. Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights, and Gender)

Please clarify why beneficiaries have been identified by eco-climatic regions considering the scope of the project.

3/16/2021: Comment on the stakeholders table cleared. On the beneficiaries, it is still not clear if there is a linkage between the eco-climatic regions and the stakeholders

expected to be involved in transparency activities and therefore beneficiaries of the training activities the project will carry out. Please clarify.

6/15/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

Research institutions, and the University of Burundi in particular, have been added to *Table 4. Stakeholders identified?* (p. 31). Stakeholders identified in the gender equality and women's empowerment have also been included.

A clarification has been provided on why beneficiaries have been identified by eco-climatic regions, based on differences in vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change and related adaptation options (p. 31).

May 11, 2021

Further clarifications have been added to section 2. *Stakeholders* (p. 32) and also to PART I Section F. *Project's Target Contributions to GEF Core Indicators* (p. 3). A total number of 100 direct beneficiaries is estimated to participate in project activities, including ministries staff, decision-makers, civil society organizations (CSOs) and representatives of local communities, who shall benefit especially from workshops and training events. . Especially concerning the participation of CSOs and local communities, the men and women who will benefit from training at the time of project implementation will be representatives to be selected in the five (5) eco-climatic regions of Burundi. At least fifteen (15) candidates representing CSOs and local communities will be identified per eco-climatic region and trained, aiming at achieving gender balance (50% of women and 50% of men). Indeed, Burundi has five eco-climatic regions (as identified in the map under section 1b. Project Map and Coordinates) which present some differences in vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change. It follows that the adaptation options are defined according to these regions in order to meet their diverse needs.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: As it is not yet clear if the private sector will be engaged, please clarify what role might be considered important in the context of this project. Please clarify if the private sector has had any engagement to date on NC or BUR1 projects.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared at this stage.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

The private sector is still little engaged in climate change action. Further information on the private sector actors are already engaged in NCs and BUR1 projects has been provided in section 4. *Private sector* (p. 33). The country expects to improve their participation through CBIT, especially from the energy sector. During project preparation phase, relevant stakeholders from the private sector will be identified and a strategy to engage them will be developed, building upon results of previous reports.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes.

3/6/2021: In addition to risks due to COVID, please highlight if there are any opportunities to support Burundi's recovery.

6/15/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

May 11, 2021

A brief COVID-19 Opportunity analysis has been included in the PIF and will be further elaborated at PPG stage (p. 35-36).

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please add as well the role of the implementing agency in this project.

On coordination with other initiatives, such as BUR1, we welcome the description provided. However, it is not clear how the CBIT project will build on the BUR activities and not duplicate them. Several activities described here seem to be identical to those being proposed in the CBIT project, such as technical capacity building GHG inventories etc. Likewise for the national communication which will be under implementation at the same time. This needs to be clarified.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared at this stage.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

Section ?6. *Coordination?* has been amended to include the role of UNEP as the implementing agency and to provide further information on how the CBIT project will build on the BUR and Fourth National Communication activities so as to avoid duplication of efforts (p. 35-37).

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please also add the BUR.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

The BUR has been added to ?Table 6. National Priorities? (p. 38).

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Provide additional details on the Knowledge Management approach including what tools might be used. Clarify what is meant by existing communication channels and who the target groups should be. Consider the role that Burundi may be able to play in the African sub-continent or as an LDC in disseminating its lessons learned.

3/16/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

January 20, 2021

The Knowledge Management section has been substantially improved to clarify the approach envisaged, including tools and communication channels, as well as target groups (p. 39-40).

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes, it has been assessed as low risk.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Yes, Mr. Emmanuel Ndorimana has endorsed the project.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/3/2020: Please address comments.

3/16/2021: Please address comments.

6/15/2021: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/3/2020	1/20/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2021	5/11/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval