

Support for the management and reduction of food waste in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12268

Countries

Venezuela

Project Name

Support for the management and reduction of food waste in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

1/14/2026

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Remy Ruat

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

All comments where addressed.

on the general information table:

1. Executing partner in LoE is 'to be determined', while in Portal is the Ministry of People's Power for Ecosocialism (MINEC) - please change the Portal matching the LoE. This can be changed during preparation.

RR (2/17/2026):

1. In its current form, the project is not eligible for GEF CCM funding, as it focuses on downstream waste management (including waste to energy) which while relevant at local level are not cost-effective for the level of investment possible by the GEF. GEF CCM funding under objective 1.1 focuses on resource efficiency and circularity leading to cost effective GEB generation. The focus of this project pilot investments on waste management is reflected in a low emission reductions target, which confirms the low cost-effectiveness of the proposed intervention. Please see below some suggested revisions:

- Overall, the focus of the concept should be rebalanced from waste management towards waste prevention, where most of the GEB potential is.

- Component 1, which focuses on the entire circular economy value chain, is mostly eligible, as it is likely to improve enabling conditions for emission reductions at all levels. It would benefit from increased emphasis in terms of funding relative to other components, in particular for activities related to standard setting and incentives and procurement related work (1.1.4) - which could also be the focus of related pilot activities for example.

- Component 2 focuses on awareness raising mostly, with an emphasis that seems a bit too high in regards to the weight of this barrier as an obstacle to reducing food waste. The focus could be reduced to emphasize work on the incentive structure further (as noted above, in component 1). In addition, while 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 seem to adopt a whole of cycle approach, 2.1.1., owing to the stakeholders targeted, seems to focus on waste management mostly - the focus of the revised component would make more sense on prevention.

- component 3 is in its current shape not eligible, as the pilots focus exclusively on downstream waste management through waste valorization, and are disjointed from the upstream work explored under component 1. As noted above, some of the elements included in component 1 could lend themselves well for pilot investments, for example in terms of Public-private partnership mechanisms designed for fiscal incentives and public procurement policy for companies that promote FLWR. Outputs 3.1.1 to 3.1.3 would benefit from revisions to reflect this scope change.

- the scope of component 4 would benefit from some clarifications as to how it articulates with the policy/strategy orientations to be defined under component 1.

- for reference on other avenues to identify more aligned pilot interventions, and as the KJWA process is mentioned, the GEF support along those lines relates rather to on-farm interventions on improved soil carbon, improved nutrient use and manure management towards sustainable and resilient agricultural systems, and improved livestock management systems. The GEF will support enabling frameworks, capacity development and investment activities with clear potential to result in cost-effective and high impact climate mitigation outcomes in the agriculture sector along these types of interventions.

- or, as it relates to food waste prevention/avoidance, please see indicative examples below, as currently explored under project ID 11952:

> Upstream: policy related work on food donation (e.g. at distribution and catering level to avoid operators discarding recoverable food); regulatory measures and guidance on date labels to prevent safe food being discarded; food waste deterrence and revenue mobilization through disposal surcharge fees.

> Midstream: incentives oriented measures to promote waste avoidance: liability protection, food safety guidance and infrastructure, support to better planning, processing and storage practices at processing and distribution level, engagement with private sector on cutting food waste.

> Connecting upstream and downstream : developing end markets for compost through procurement and incentives for compost application

Agency's Comments

26 May 2026

1. Noted. The portal has been changed as requested to "be determined" in line with the OFP LoE.

27 April 2026

Thank you for the comments. The PIF has been restructured to better align the CCM objective 1.1, shifting the focus to upstream food waste and loss (FWL) prevention, thereby increasing cost-effectiveness and also the generation of GEBs, specifically the mitigation of GHG.

The budget of component 1 was increased, strengthening output 1.1.4, which is focused on standard-setting, fiscal incentives, and sustainable public procurement.

The budget for component 2 was reduced, redirecting a portion to regulatory and incentives schemes of component 1. The training and capacity building output now focuses on upstream and midstream FWL prevention and avoidance rather than downstream waste management practices. The awareness campaigns now are designed to support and roll out the good practices manual, food donation protocols, and tax incentive structures developed across other components.

Component 3 was redesigned to emphasize active prevention of FLW and resources efficiency. The pilots in the wholesale markets, selected due strategic and catalytic reasons, triggering changes along the whole value chain, now focus on cold chain optimization, storage practices, and logistic management systems to prevent food loss at the source. The pilots serve as testbeds for public-private partnership, food donation protocols, and tax/fiscal incentive structures developed under component 1. The budget was reduced to strengthen component 1.

The scope of component 4 was clarified to establish a dynamic, two-way feedback loop with component 1, ensuring that knowledge management and monitoring directly inform policy design.

Under this approach, the national network of innovation (output 4.1.1) and data on food waste reduction will serve as the primary sources of real-world data and lessons learned from the pilots to directly calibrate the sectoral policies and targets (output 1.1.2) and distribution standards (output 1.1.3). Furthermore, the replicability plan and university research (outputs 4.1.2 and 4.1.3) have been specifically oriented to assess the effectiveness of the fiscal incentives and public procurement pilots designed in component 1, providing the necessary evidence for their scaling up at the national level.

The present project does not consider direct intervention on farms, but focuses on the next steps of the chain: transport, wholesale markets and food distribution.

We appreciate the example provided from project ID 11952, and several ideas were included in the redesign of the PIF. For instance, food donation policies (component 1), liability protection and better planning and storage at the distribution level (component 3), and linking public procurement with compost application to incentive its utilization.

2. Project Summary

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. The summary is too long - the three first paragraphs could be moved to an appropriate location in the project rationale section, and summarized into one paragraph for the summary (one sentence on food waste trends, one sentence on related climate relevance for UNFCCC/GHG balance, one sentence on why current national policies/efforts are facing issues to address this. The last paragraph of the summary, which is a bit heavy, could be split in two to improve the flow.

2. Thank you for revising the summary after revising project design to reflect any changes in components, theory of change, outcomes.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

1. The summary has been synthesized as requested.

2. The summary was reviewed as requested.

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

Thank you for the revisions

> The formulation of output 3.1.2 mentions : "Feasibility and viability studies, on fiscal incentive options (reduced fees, tax benefits, preferential treatment), implemented to promote FLW prevention." - it is a bit unclear what preferential treatment means when just reading the label, so it would perhaps be best, to avoid confusion, to remove the term from the title.

RR (2/17/2026):

1. The objective is currently unclear and contradictory, which reflects the current framing of this project : it first mentions an intent to prevent food waste generation, but then indicates that this is to be done by improving efficiency of its use - which entails that waste is generated (therefore not prevented). In other words, the objectives reflect the emphasis of this project on downstream waste management, while to be eligible it would need to shift scope towards waste prevention through actions at other levels of the value chain. Could you please revise the objective in line with comments made above about project scope?

2. Could you please see comments above about project restructuring and revise logical framework accordingly?

Agency's Comments

26 May 2026

Thank you for the comment, which is welcomed. To avoid misinterpretations, the term "preferential treatment" was deleted.

27 April 2026

1. The objective was reviewed to emphasize that prevention of food waste generation will be achieved upstream by implementing actions that avoid losses before it occurs.

2. The LFM was reviewed as requested, focusing on upstream and midstream interventions.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

Yes

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Noted. Since the project operates within urban food systems and municipal markets, where women play critical roles in food commercialization and management, gender considerations will be deeply embedded in the project activities. A gender analysis and action plan will be developed during PPG phase. Resources will be allocated to document best practices, develop a national replication plan, and share lessons learned on food waste prevention both nationally and regionally.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments
Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

Yes - PMC below 5%, and adjustments were made in the repartition of funding across components.

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Noted.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

1. Cleared, well noted in conjunction with the revisions in scope focusing on cold chain, logistics inefficiencies and markets as entry points to the broader supply chain.

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions.

1. Per provided numbers, the targeted segments do not correspond to where most of the issue and potential are in terms of GHG emission reductions, with less than 10% of organic waste streams transiting at city level through the mentioned municipal markets (in a context where this is already a small share of the national level organic waste streams). Could you please revise the project rationale reflecting a prioritization of interventions which corresponds to maximized mitigation potential.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

The project rationale and theory of change were reviewed to shift from waste management to a systemic resource efficiency and upstream prevention approach.

Wholesale municipal markets are prioritized as high-leverage systemic nodes, not disposal sites. Addressing inefficiencies there (cold chain, logistics) prevents waste both upstream and downstream. Intervening in this transit node triggers a systemic reduction impacting the 28% of waste occurring in homes and losses during rural transport, maximizing GHG mitigation. The market pilots will serve as scalable models for the national FLW policy, providing data and frameworks needed to regulate and incentivize the remaining of the national waste stream.

The focus from waste processing to avoid waste generation has contributed to a significantly higher GHG mitigation-to-investment ratio.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

A few elements are missing for completeness of the rationale:

1. Could you please add one paragraph describing how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
2. Could you please add one paragraph describing how the drivers of food loss and waste in the country are expected to evolve in the future (there is detailed information on current baseline, but not on future evolution - this can be qualitative in case quantitative scenarios are missing) - such drivers may be socio-economic (price signals, consumption/demographic patterns), or physical (e.g. key climate/environmental risks as applicable). The paragraph could usefully end on how this may inform project design to ensure resilience to future changes.

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments
26 May 2026

1 & 2. Thank you for the comments. The section has been updated to incorporate the subjects mentioned.

27 April 2026

Noted.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

0. Cleared

1. Cleared

2. cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

0. The theory of change diagram still reflect the previous version of the design and related outputs/activities (e.g. waste processing and valorization related work) - could you please update it accordingly? The paragraph just above the diagram would also benefit from an update as it still refers to waste collection related activities.

1. Cleared - please see above

2. The revised description is still at component level - as a quick fix, could you please list the outputs as they appear in the logical framework above directly under each component (for example at the end of the description of the component)?

2bis - noted clarifications on 1.1.5 - at PPG stage please further explore the viability of designing such a complex finance window with such a small financing amount - revolving funds require significant transaction costs to be set up, and are usually not worth the financial engineering effort for small investment envelopes - but with sufficient co-financing the perspectives might differ - thank you for including in the PPG schedule a pre-assessment of likely options and corresponding engagement of potential partners.

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

0. Could you please revise project theory of change in line with comments made in section 1 above about eligibility?

1. The TOC figure is too small and cannot be read - could you please revise?

2. After revising the scope per comments noted in section 1 above, we recommend strengthening the description of the project components by providing a more detailed breakdown by output, including a clear explanation of the scope, sequencing, and expected activities under each output.

For example, output 1.1.5, focused on the design of a mixed finance mechanism to support innovation projects, is a critical element for ensuring the project's long-term sustainability and catalytic impact beyond the project lifetime. As such, additional information should be provided on the proposed structure and operationalization of the mechanism, including its governance arrangements, risk-sharing mechanisms, and the roles of public and private stakeholders. Further clarification is also encouraged regarding the expected sources of capitalization, potential co-financiers, and the financial instruments to be deployed (e.g., grants, concessional loans, guarantees, or equity). This information would help assess the mechanism's viability, additionality, and alignment with the project's overall theory of change. While we acknowledge that some of these details may not yet be fully defined at the PIF stage, we recommend that the approach, timeline, and key design parameters be further elaborated at the CEO endorsement/approval stage, once feasibility analyses and stakeholder consultations have been completed.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2026

0. Thank you for noting this. Both the ToC and the text have been updated.

2. Noted, lists with the outputs were included in the description of the components.

2.bis. Noted with thanks, the comment is much appreciated. During PPG phase, a pre-assessment will rigorously evaluate financial viability of the proposed window as well as identifying other co-finance opportunities and evaluate alternatives if needed.

27 April 2026

0. The TOC was reviewed as requested. The logic now emphasized maintaining food within the human consumption chain and leveraging municipal wholesale markets as systemic nodes to trigger multiplier effect for GHG mitigation across the value chain.

1. The TOC diagram has been uploaded in high resolution, and also uploaded separately in the GEF portal for better visualization.

2. Thank you for the comments. The description of components was extended in the PIF, providing clear sequencing of activities. Regarding output 1.1.5, it's considered a catalytic element for sustainability. At PIF stage, the mechanism is envisioned as a mixed finance window designed to de-risk private investment in cold chains and logistical innovations, an hybrid model combining small grants for technical feasibility with a revolving fund or guarantee scheme for equipment (e.g. refrigeration). The project will seek to capitalize this window through public budget allocations and private sector co-financing.

Detailed governance, risk-sharing arrangements, potential co-financiers and specific financial instruments will be identified during PPG following comprehensive feasibility analyses and stakeholder consultations to ensure additionality and alignment with the national financial context.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared - please see comments in other sections

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions -as noted in component 1 incremental cost reasoning does not apply to the current scope which does not generate substantial GEBs and is not eligible.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

Following the restructuring of the project, the incremental cost reasoning was rewritten, to be better aligned with GEF climate change criteria and ensure substantial and measurable GEBs by directly preventing waste generation at the source.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. Agency execution support is noted as Yes. In principle, for Agency dual-execution at the PIF stage, dual-execution should not be included the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in the PPG to substantiate a dual-execution request, the Agency may submit full information and justification for this request. Please therefore change this to No for now - and related description text, and this will be noted for further exploration during CEO ER based on Agency assessment. For information, as per the new GEF guidelines, consultation to the GEF Secretariat on potential support services by the implementation agency shall occur at least six months before CEO Approval date.

2. Description of coordination with other initiatives to be updated based on revisions to project scope. We may also signal potential for coordination with the global project on food waste for methane mitigation led by UNEP - GEFID 11952.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

1. Thank you for the comment. Kindly note that the GEF PIF template asks for agencies to mention if this is a possibility, and considering the country specific context, it's a possibility that has been considered. Regardless, we have deselected the box as requested, and will further analyze the situation during the PPG with the Ministry of People's Power for Ecosocialism (MINEC). If execution support is requested by MINEC, the updated GEF policies and guidelines will be followed.

2. Thank you for the recommendation, which is very much appreciated. During PPG phase, UNEP will be contacted and engaged to identify specific technical synergies, to ensure that during implementation there will be adequate sharing of best practices and that Venezuela's intervention is synchronized with global interventions.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared
2. Cleared - to be updated during PPG as relevant

RR (5/5/2026):

1. Under CI11, the PIF lists 10,000 total beneficiaries under CI11, comprising 3,000 "direct" (operational staff, technicians) and 7,000 "indirect" (consumers, wholesalers). GEF CI11 covers direct beneficiaries only. If the 7,000 are genuinely indirect, CI11 should report 3,000, not 10,000. Recommend clarifying the direct/indirect categorization and adjusting CI11 accordingly.

2. Please see below detailed comments. In summary, given time constraints, the preferable option at this stage might be to (i) remove from the scope expected emission reductions from national landfills diversion, and only keep those related to fuel savings and prevention (which I would not call upstream, as this upstream would correspond rather to TA and policy related work), (ii) adopt a time scope corresponding to the lifetime of the investments and of the emission reduction processes which they enable - so maximum 20 years, (iii) clarify whether this is only based on the project pilots, and then it should be categorized as direct - or if this corresponds to an estimated share of sectoral potential - and in such case this would correspond rather to a top down indirect emission reductions estimate / or a mix of both, and in such case please split accordingly between direct and indirect.

a. The justification text under the core indicator table still refers to activities that have from my understanding been removed from project design - could you please remove for consistency (or clarify whether this understanding is mistaken)?

> *"These markets collectively generate 327,600 tons/year of food waste a volume that will be diverted from landfills toward composting and other organic recovery processes between 2028 and 2048."*

> *"new emissions stemming from composting processes."*

the above are just examples but this appears everywhere throughout the description text. It is surprising to see in the PIF description that the project will focus on prevention, and then in the justification annex that *"98% corresponds to waste that is generated but treated through composting rather than landfilling"*. The selection of only a 2% diversion rate for upstream efforts which reflect the core focus of the project seems misaligned with the project's design. One could argue that what would be relevant to report for the GEF project is only the upstream part, and not the 98% related to composting. In other words, the main assumption/hypothesis underpinning the entire calculation is not in line with project design : *"Diversion: 327,600 tons/year of food waste from landfills to composting during the period"* - as the main focus of the project is not on diverting food waste towards composting but on preventing this waste.

b. There seem to be a confusion on what is considered implementation period and lifetime period - *"The calculation covers the implementation period (2028-2048) plus the permanence of post-project reductions until 2108, reflecting the useful life of methane in landfills according to the FOD degradation kinetics."*

> GEF Project implementation period is 5 years - per RMF guidelines the calculation period usually covers the lifetime of investments - but in the table this lifetime (which serves as basis for the total calculated reductions) has been set to 20 years and we would need strong justification for going beyond, which does not seem warranted here. Thank you for clarifying and revising accordingly - for conservativeness, would suggest simply removing the FOD legacy part of the calculation. But most importantly there should be some qualitative justification clarifying why the investment lifetime is expected to be 20 years? this should be based on equipment lifetime, like for example for the cold storage facilities, or for the vehicle lifetime (if vehicles are concerned), or any other facilities involved.

c. There seems to be another confusion between what is considered direct and indirect. In the scope of this project, the direct emission reductions would be those stemming from the pilot investments in output 3.1.1 (cold chain optimization, storage practices and logistics management systems in three (3) Municipal Wholesale Markets (MWM) to prevent food loss and enhance resource efficiency). Anything else than this (if included in the scope of the calculation, which is not mandatory) would need to be categorized as indirect.

RR (2/17/2026):

1. The excel sheets for the GHG calculations in Annex 1 seem incomplete - there is a sheet reporting aggregate values for the 3 targeted locations, but the results tab of each of the corresponding excel files is blank, with only default values entered into all other tabs. could you please clarify?

2. Further, it seems that the method used is not adequate to reflect the content of the project, with most impactful interventions happening in the context of activities beyond these 3 pilots - which are also ineligible in their current form as they focus only on waste management.

3. There are a variety of tools which could be used to revise the calculation in change of the revised scope of the project emphasizing more waste prevention rather than management. Such tools are also perhaps best suited to the project-based nature of this calculation. Please see non exhaustive list below - the most relevant methodology may be the ReFED impact calculator. Project ID 11952, which follows a similar scope and size of investment at city level, used the following approach for estimating city level impact of their interventions (which were more upstream than those proposed by this project) at an indirect level. This is an example and does not mean that this is applicable as is for this project, but please see below in case it might inform your approach.

Extract from core indicator justification under GEFID 11952 (also available on the public webpage of the PIF on GEF portal):

"the project will carry out: (1) Pilot interventions at the city-level that are expected to result in indirect GHG emission reductions; (2) Policy and cross-supply chain interventions at the national-level that are also expected to result in additional indirect GHG emission reduction. Component 2 will focus on indirect GHG emissions reduction through pilot interventions in Colombia and Mauritius. While selection of cities will be finalized at PPG stage, assumptions are made here with capital cities to provide an indication of mitigation potential of this project: Bogotá for Colombia and Port Louis for Mauritius. The amount of food waste generated in each city was calculated from the weight of the city in each country based on population levels using country-level food waste baselines established under the UNEP Food Waste Index Report 2024. While current baselines for each city exist, these account for all municipal organic waste without disaggregating food waste specifically. This project will also support refining city-level baselines under output 2.1. Based on results of application of similar interventions at city-level by WRAP, it is estimated that upstream and mid-stream activities in pilots in Bogotá and Port-Louis implemented through this project will result in a 15% reduction in food waste. Therefore, mitigation potential was calculated by accounting for

methane emissions avoided through diversion of 15% food waste in each city over four years. Based on these assumptions, the estimated indirect GHG emissions mitigated is of 151,305 metric tonnes of CO₂e over four years. Please refer to Annex H for further details. In addition to the indirect GHG emissions mitigated through pilot interventions at city level in Colombia and Mauritius (as described above), we have modeled for indirect GHG emissions mitigation from policy and cross-supply chain collaborations interventions at national level. The replication potential was modeled in the two selected country pilots operating under the assumption that with a similar level of engagement and participation from both countries, the project will be successful in addressing key barriers surrounding the lack of awareness and tested models at the national level for approaching food waste reduction through consumer behavior change and supply chain interventions as well as limited availability of integrated measurement frameworks accounting for food waste. For each country pilot, the total mitigation potential of a 50% food waste reduction was calculated over four years - in alignment with the targets set by the Food Waste breakthrough - followed by the application of a causality factor to estimate indirect emissions reductions linked to this project's influence in each pilot country (1% causality factor applied in Colombia, 3% in Mauritius). A different factor is applied to both countries given the variations in size of populations and the sector more broadly, as well as differences in markets which are likely to result in differences in level of uptake by the relevant stakeholders in both countries. Based on these variations, the project assumes a higher likelihood of replication in Mauritius as compared to a much larger country like Colombia where the scale of the problem is bigger. Based on this methodology and aforementioned assumptions, the anticipated replication effect could lead to an additional 50,680 metric tonnes of CO₂e mitigated. This represents the broader catalytic impact of the project beyond initial pilots at city-level."

List of tools (listed as part of project ID 11952 which will perform work to review them and consolidate guidance on the matter)

- 1) The UNEP Food Waste Index methodology, which supports national-level measurement at household, retail, and food service levels ? intended for use at global and national levels;*
- 2) The US EPA Avoided Landfilled Food Waste Methane Emissions Calculator, which enables quantification of methane reductions associated with food waste diversion from landfills- intended for use at national level;*
- 3) The ReFED Impact Calculator, which quantifies environmental and financial impacts of different food waste interventions, mostly from methane emissions ? intended for use at all levels, including private sector;*
- 4) The FRAME Tool developed by the Global FoodBanking Network, which helps assess and communicate the social and environmental impacts from methane emissions of surplus food recovery and redistribution ? intended for use at civil society level, mostly from food banks.*
- 5) WRI's Food Loss and Waste (FLW) Protocol: a global accounting and reporting standard providing a consistent framework for quantifying food loss and waste across the supply chain - intended for use at national level, corporate level, and city level.*
- 6) IFC's Food Loss Climate Impact Tool: an Excel-based model estimating GHG emissions from food loss at farm level and production, assessed by commodity and value chain stage - intended for use at project and supply-chain level.*
- 7) WRAP's Scope 3 GHG Measurement and Reporting Protocols for Food and Drink: sector-specific guidance and resources for measuring, reporting, and reducing supply chain emissions linked to food and drink businesses - intended for use at corporate and sectoral level.*

8) *FAO's NEXT tool, which also looks includes a food waste module following IPCC guidance (production based estimates)*

4. Please also double check accounting period for consistency (currently 20 year in the table and 18 in the justification text).

Agency's Comments 26 May 2026

1. Noted, the text has been updated to clarify that the direct beneficiaries are indeed estimated to be 10,000 people.

2. Duly noted. The GHG mitigation estimated have been redone to match the current project design. All emissions from composting and large-scale landfill diversion were removed. The timeframe has been capped at 20 years (2028-2047), omitting any FOD legacy extension from the main target. The 20 years period corresponds to the service life of the cold storage and logistic assets to be deployed. Direct emissions have downscaled to 3,375,548 tCO₂eq and are now derived exclusively from physical pilot investments across the three markets targeted under output 3.1.1 (Mercabar, Tariba and Coche). This comprises 1,596,799 tCO₂eq from avoided landfill methane, 1,771,686 tCO₂eq from avoided upstream lifecycle emissions via food loss prevention, and 7,063 tCO₂eq from transport fuel savings. Potential scalation to other four markets are considered as indirect/catalytic potential in a conservative way. All core indicators tables and text descriptions have been updated for consistency. A technical report with the calculations has been uploaded as Annex in the portal.

27 April 2026

Thank you for the comments.

1. The project utilized the official IPCC Waste Model spreadsheet for calculation. The IPCC tool is formatted for large-scale national data, so the small decimal fractions were not displaying correctly, being seemingly zero. To overcome this situation of limitation in the visualization of the software, and to ensure full transparency under the EFT, we have documented the calculations and the real non-zero values in the Annexed Technical Report.

2. We scaled up from the three initial pilot interventions to seven strategic wholesale markets and the scope has shifter from waste management to upstream circular economy and food waste prevention, actively reducing generation at the source. This shift has increased considerably the project net mitigation contribution to 4,545,253 tCO₂eq.

3. Thank you for the recommendations which are greatly appreciated. The project has incorporated the following approach:

While tools like ReFED and the FLW Protocol are excellent for capturing supply chain dynamics, we opted to apply the IPCC 2006 Guidelines (Volumes 2 and 4) to calculate the carbon footprint and upstream emissions avoided by food waste prevention. This guarantees full consistency with Venezuela's 2024 National GHG INGEI and its official climate reporting under the ETF.

Inspired by the referenced project methodology, our revised calculations apply a conservative 2% prevention rate on the total volume of food diverted. This directly captures the mitigation

of agricultural production, post-harvest losses, refrigerated transport, and cold storage before the food becomes waste.

This hybrid approach successfully combines the project-based tracking of upstream preventive activities recommended by the GEF with rigorous, government-aligned emission factors of the IPCC, preventing 93,563 tCO₂eq strictly from prevention measures.

4. To ensure full alignment with the new Technical Report and the First Order Decay (FOD) kinetics of the IPCC methodology, the timeline has been unified as follows:

Implementation Period: 2028 to 2048 representing the active phase of the project's operations across the expanded seven markets.

The calculations account for the real atmospheric decay of methane in landfills up to year 2108 (60 years post-project), as required by IPCC Tier 2 methodology to accurately reflect global environmental benefits.

More detail of the calculation can be found in the core indicators section of the PIF and in the Annex with the technical report.

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsNA

5.6 RISKS

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

3. Noted

4. Noted

5. Noted

(5/5/2026)

1. Per the ESS screening sheet enclosed, the corresponding risk is classified as Low - but it appears as Moderate on the Risks table - could you please revise the Risk table risk to match the ESS screening one?

2. Also, the table mentions "social impacts on informal waste collectors" and identify "conducting a comprehensive Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (EIES) during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG); developing an Environmental and Social Management Plan (PGAS) and a Stakeholder Engagement Plan that includes informal waste collectors" as mitigation measures. However, this risk and mitigation measures are not recognized in the screening document. Please revise the environmental and social risks screening document and make these risks consistent with each other.

3. Fiduciary risk: the mitigation is entirely deferred to the PPG phase with no present-stage specificity. Please strengthen the mitigation narrative, referencing FAO's specific fiduciary framework, fund flow mechanisms that account for UCM constraints, and any precedent from existing FAO-managed projects in Venezuela. Please also ensure FAO is not described as executing entity at PIF stage throughout the entire document.

4. Political and Governance: The mitigation narrative should be strengthened with specific mechanisms for managing political economy risks beyond the PPG phase.

5. Capacity: A low rating for Venezuela is very difficult to justify. MINEC's convening capacity is cited as the basis for this rating, but our understanding from a policy perspective is that institutional capacity in Venezuela is severely constrained by years of economic deterioration. Recommend upgrading to Substantial, with mitigation that specifically addresses PMU staffing, technical assistance arrangements, and contingency plans for institutional disruption.

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

1. Suggest revising some of the risk rating, particularly the "political and governance" and considering updating it to Moderate.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2026

1. Thank you for noting this, it has been corrected to Low in line with the ESS screening.

2. The reference to informal waste collectors was removed and following the strategic shift in project design, the scope is now focused exclusively on upstream interventions rather than downstream waste management. Consequently, there is no direct interaction or expected impact on informal waste collectors within the revised project boundaries. Regardless, during PPG phase an analysis will be conducted to confirm that no unintended indirect impacts exist, and the management plan will be updated accordingly if needed.

3. Context has been provided to the narrative of the risk. Previous experiences with GEF projects in the country that have found successful mechanisms to overcome the challenges imposed by the UCMs have been included, considering that the country is classified as FCV, and support has been required to execute the grant in compliance with international standards, although FAO has not been described as the executing entity. During PPG, alternatives will be explored, following GEF policies and procedures.

4. Noted, the narrative was expanded to include long-term sustainability mechanisms and operational continuity given the context in the country, including multi-stakeholder governance and social oversight, institutional and political anchoring and adaptive management and continuous monitoring.

5. Noted, the risk has been updated as suggested and the narrative adjusted to provide context on the measures to be taken to strengthen the capacities.

27 April 2026

The Political and governance risk rating was reviewed as suggested. Due to the intersectoral nature of the intervention, the mitigation strategy was strengthened to emphasize a continuous, high level institution dialogue and interagency collaborations to ensure long term stability regardless of administration changes.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Noted.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. Could you please see comments in section 1 above and reflect in the justification here after revisions to project scope?

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Adjustments were made to this section, in line with the reviewed PIF, which is now better aligned with GEF-8 programming strategies and national priorities, by shifting the focus to upstream food waste prevention and efficiency on the use of resources, which is aligned directly with objective CCM 1.1. of the GEF-8 climate change focal area.

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. The project notes "capture and use of methane emissions from the waste sector" as a key element of sectoral alignment - could you please clarify whether refocusing this project on reducing methane generating waste in the first place would still be aligned with sectoral priorities.

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Refocusing the project on waste prevention at the sources remains fully aligned with Venezuela's national and sectoral priorities and actually enhances the cost-effectiveness of the intervention.

While the NDC explicitly mentions the capture and use of methane emissions from the waste sector as a specific mitigation action, the core objective of the national policy is the reduction of GHG emissions. By shifting focus towards food waste prevention and circularity, the project directly stops organic matter from entering landfills in the first place. This avoids the generation of methane altogether, which is a significantly more cost-effective and efficient solution than capturing it downstream.

Furthermore, this adjusted focus strictly aligns with the sixth transformation of the "Plan of the Fatherland of the 7 Transformations" (2025) and the "Gran Misi?n Madre Tierra", both of which emphasize sustainable consumption, respect for the Mother Earth cycles, and resources efficiency. By moving from management to prevention, the project maximizes resource efficiency and ensures a higher impact on national climate targets.

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. Could you please clarify alignment with relevant KMGBF targets (there is one which targets food waste) and clarify how the project will contribute?

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Although not a biodiversity project, there is a clear contribution to Target 16 of the KMGBF, on Enabling Sustainable Consumption Choices to Reduce Waste and Overconsumption. Specifically, it will contribute to halve global food waste, reduce overconsumption and substantially reduce waste generation. there is a direct contribution to the Component indicator "Food waste index". The contributions will be achieved through:

- Developing a national sectoral plan and local policies focused on preventing food waste before it happens.
- Promoting circular economy practices and behavioral changes needed in consumption and distribution patterns to reduce generation of organic waste.

Additionally, by reducing loss of organic materials at the sources, the project indirectly can diminish the pressure on agricultural production systems and supply chains, indirectly supporting target 10 on sustainable agriculture, reducing the expansion of agricultural frontier, and also indirectly contributing to Target 7 by reducing fertilizer use and hence reducing pollution.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

Could you please confirm whether IPLCs have been consulted in the preparation of this PIF?

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Consultation were made at the local level with representatives from municipal bodies and from community roundtables in charge of recycling to learn about their experiences in food waste generation and management. Regarding IPs, given that the project interventions will take place in urban food systems and municipal markets, no direct impact on indigenous people's territories or traditional livelihoods are expected.

As the project directly involves local communities, such as market workers, local vendors and civil society organization in urban areas, a comprehensive stakeholder mapping and consultation process with relevant local communities will be implemented during PPG phase, ensuring active participation in the co-design of the food waste prevention activities, in full compliance with FAO's and GEF's environmental and social safeguards.

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

Secretariat's Comments
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

1. Please clarify how meaningful consultations were conducted (or will be) with vulnerable groups in urban areas including informal waste collectors, and how results of the consultations have been (or will be) integrated into the project design

Agency's Comments
26 May 2026

In response to these GEF Sec comments:

1. Please clarify how meaningful consultations were conducted (or will be) with vulnerable groups in urban areas including informal waste collectors, and how results of the consultations have been (or will be) integrated into the project design
In addition, the same question is asked about consultations with CSOs - grateful if you could include that in your response.

Agency response: the consultation strategy for vulnerable groups in urban areas has been included, and during PPG phase, consultations will be conducted through multi-stakeholder workshops and focus groups at the strategic commercial hubs to assess baseline conditions and adjust the interventions according to the identified conditions and operational challenges.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

Agency's CommentsNA
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

Agency's CommentsNA
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsNA
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsNA
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsNA
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (2/17/2026):

50k requested

Agency's CommentsNA

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

Format wise this is OK - but the content reflects a project scope which will undergo restructuring. Thank you for double checking whether all co-financing letters are still relevant after revisions to project design.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

After the restructured project, while the focus has been rebalanced towards waste prevention at the source, downstream management and valorization remain integral elements for the comprehensive national sectoral plans to be developed. Hence, the co-financing contributions already identified are still valid. Nevertheless, the agency will continue to verify and fine-tune all co-financing contributions and strive to identify other relevant stakeholders during PPG phase to ensure consistency with the final project design.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

Agency's CommentsNA

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

Agency's CommentsNA

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

Agency's CommentsNA

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

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's CommentsNA

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

Yes

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

Noted.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared - please see above consistency issue in Risk table section.

RR (2/17/2026):

Screening is attached

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

After the reviewed structure, the analysis made on safeguards remains valid.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions - currently the scope does not warrant a RM of 2 for CCM.

Agency's Comments

27 April 2026

Noted. As the PIF has been rebalanced to food waste prevention at the source and circularity, with interventions that are cost-effective to avoid methane generation, we consider that the revised scope justifies a significant contribution to CCM Rio Marker.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/5/2026)

Cleared

RR (2/17/2026):

To be further reviewed after project scope revisions

Agency's Comments
27 April 2026

Noted.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsNA

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments
RR (5/26/2026):

Project technically cleared

RR (5/5/2026)

Most comments are addressed. Thank you for addressing pending ones for resubmission

RR (2/17/2026):

Not yet -- thank you for resubmitting after revisions, and highlighting changes made in yellow for ease of review.

Agency's Comments
26 May 2026

Pending comments were addressed. Only recent changes have been left highlighted in yellow to facilitate review.

27 April 2026.

Thank you for all the comments and suggestion which are greatly appreciated. Changes were highlighted in yellow as requested.

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/26/2026):

- In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the GAP and that these are reflected in the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

- See above - including clarification of financial mechanism in particular - and GHG estimate update as relevant

RR (2/17/2026):

To be filled at the end of the review

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/17/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		