

Accelerate implementation of dental amalgam provisions and strengthen country capacities in the environmental sound management of associated wastes under the Minamata Convention

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10936

Countries

Global (Senegal, Thailand, Uruguay)

Project Name

Accelerate implementation of dental amalgam provisions and strengthen country capacities in the environmental sound management of associated wastes under the Minamata Convention

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/15/2022

Review completed by PM

6/7/2022

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project description summary. 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

May 17, 2022: Comment cleared.

May 11, 2022: Due to the resubmission, the start date already passed. Please amend both dates.

March 17, 2022: Please see comments on the alternative scenario. Please revise the expected completion date as it is before the implementation.

Agency Response

12 May 2022

The start and end dates have been revised.

7 April 2022

The expected completion date is revised.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 9, 2022: Comment addressed.

June 7, 2022: The below comment still not addressed.

May 11, 2022: Please change all 7 co-financing entries source reported as "Civil Society Organization": to "Other".

March 17, 2022: Ratios between Components and PMCs on GEF amount and co-financing are not exactly the same but they are about 9%. Please address the below points.

1. Conversion from other currencies to USD (University of Sheffield, FDI World Dental Federation, and Charite University): please explain how the USD amounts were calculated as they were not provided in the letters.

2. Type of co-financing (Solmetex, Separatory Amalgamatu, Ecocycle, Metasys, Batrec and others): Please amend the type as they appear in-kind contributions (free provisions of goods/services from themselves, rather than new purchase of goods from others for this particular project). If these are new grant contributions, please provide detailed explanations and change the category from recurrent expenditure to investment mobilized.

3. Title of the project: the title seems to have been changed since the preparation as many letters cite a different project name from the project title. Please confirm if all letters are valid in this regard.
4. Date of issuing letter (Separatory Amalgamatu): Please provide us supporting evidence when this letter was issued (e.g. email).
5. Miss spelling (Metasys): In the letter, the amount is &150,000 but please confirm this is USD150,000.
6. Unclear nature of co-financing (DRI): it is not clear what kind of contributions other than recycling service (\$50,000) they offer. This is categorized as Grant while it is not clear if there is a financial provision from the company.
7. Boundary of co-financing (WHO): The amount includes in-kind contributions for the preparation but this is not linked with the project implementation. Please adjust the amount.
8. Translation (Senegal and Uruguay): Please upload English translation.

Agency Response

8 June 2022

All 7 co-financing entries source reported as "Civil Society Organization" have been changed to "Other".

7 April 2022

1. There were significant fluctuations in exchange rates among Dollars, Euros, Swiss Francs, and Pounds in the last year. The amounts appeared in the project document used the exchange rates available at the time when the project document was drafted. The amounts can be modified now to match the current exchange rates, however, since the market is constantly changing, the amounts will still fluctuate throughout the project period. The co-financing partners are also not in a position to convert their contributing amounts into dollars as their projects are operating under the specified currency on their letters. In sum, co-financing amounts are indicative from the partners and they will be verified during project execution on an annual basis.
2. Dental amalgam separators and mercury waste disposal services will be purchased and provided to the project from these companies therefore, the type of co-financing remain as GRANT and have been modified to investment mobilized.
3. All letters are still valid, modifications were made during the UNEP review process when all the letters were received. All co-financing partners have been informed and confirmed their contribution towards the project (the title change did not impact the project components).
4. The reconfirmation email from Separatory Amalgamatu symbolizes the date of their co-financing commitment which is 16 February 2021.
5. Metasys co-financing amount is confirmed via email at \$15,000, email confirmation attached.
6. DRI plans to contribute dental separators in the amount of USD\$29,950 therefore the type of co-financing remains as GRANT and has been modified to investment mobilized.
7. WHO co-financing amount revised by removing in-kind contribution for project preparation.
8. Translation of letters from Senegal and Uruguay letters are part of the re-submission.

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 17, 2022: Comments cleared.

May 11, 2022: Sub-indicator 9.6 is quantity of mercury-containing materials (products and waste), which would be much larger than the amount of pure mercury (e.g. if the mercury is x kg contained in a product of y kg, then the number would be y kg, not x kg.). The document says "the reduction and avoidance of approximately 11.6 tons of mercury (11.3 tons avoidance and 0.3 tons of reduction)," which indicates that both are the amounts of pure mercury to be avoided or reduced by the project. If avoidance of mercury of 11.3t is purely the amount of mercury, this does not fit the sub-indicator 9.6.

March 17, 2022: It seems from the descriptions below the table that 11.3t of mercury is expected to be avoided (from future usage) and 0.3t is expected to be reduced from the project intervention. However, Indicator 9.2 (mercury reduction) is 0.3t and sub-indicator 9.6 (amount of waste) is described 11.3t, which are also not in line with the results framework. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

Agency Response

12 May 2022

Sub-indicator 9.2 has been revised to 11.6 tons as this represents the total quantity of mercury to be reduced and avoided through project interventions.

7 April 2022

Targets on reduction and avoidance have been aligned in different parts of the project document, including the core indicators worksheet and results framework.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there 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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 11, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022: Yes, please also add relevant information of MIAs in this section (at least for Uruguay and Senegal which completed MIAs).

Agency Response

7 April 2022

Information related to Uruguay and Senegal MIAs are described in section 7 of the project document under Consistency with National Priorities and also added under the baseline scenario section.

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 11, 2022: Comments cleared.

March 17, 2022: Please replace ToC as it is not readable (Diagram 2 as well). ToC should focus on how the project achieve GEBs through project interventions addressing underlying issues and barriers.

Component 1: Please clarify what forms and scope (usage of amalgam only or including sound management of wastes) of "three national policies" as described in results framework are expected to be produced by this component (e.g. national plans/regulations/standards), which will be approved by participating governments. Please also clarify how the project will strengthen and institutionalize coordination and collaboration/communications between health and environment ministries or equivalent to achieve the project objective and ensure coherence among policies and regulations. Please elaborate what mechanisms will be put in place to utilize and disseminate produced knowledge and knowledge products among stakeholders within these countries.

Component 2: The title of outcome 2 is "Dental health facilities implement sound management practices for handling of dental amalgam and their wastes" while the project will deal with mercury waste outside the dental health facilities, and the outcome would be not just implementation but demonstration of technologies/methods/practices. Please revise the titles of outcome and outputs under this component. Please confirm that the project identified in the participating countries controlled land fill sites and other infrastructure where mercury wastes can be environmentally safely disposed to implement this component.

Component 3: Please clarify which countries' knowledge/practices other than participating countries will be gathered and utilized in producing knowledge products under this component, which would be more suitable for other countries to use. Please explain how the global knowledge hub will be sustained and updated after the project. Please also see comment on KM.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

ToC and Diagram 2 have been replaced in the Portal for clarity.

Component 1: The project will facilitate and support the process of establishing or improving regulations/policies in project countries related to dental amalgam, including recommendations to improve dental materials/devices management and supply chain management, and restricting the use of dental amalgam to its encapsulated form and ensure its environmentally sound management as waste. The three target countries have different regulations in place, for example, Uruguay has already stopped dental amalgam since 2014 and would like to focus on the waste management aspects of the issue, while Thailand is midway through its phase down and Senegal has almost no actions taken towards this issue. Therefore the forms and scope of the policy reinforcement, including management of its associated wastes, will vary among the 3 target countries.

Stakeholder participation will be ensured through Project Steering Committee meetings. Health Ministries will take the lead based on the nature of the oral health issue, however, the project will ensure close coordination with the Ministry of Environment where most of the other Minamata Convention related projects are

managed. The PSC will consist of stakeholders from key ministries, agencies and NGO representatives which will be decided at the organization of the inception workshop. Consultative workshops will be conducted throughout the project in all countries. And all materials produced through the project will be made readily available to stakeholders including the public. The repository and knowledge hub to be established within the Global Mercury Partnership will disseminate information and experience and promote exchange at the global level while each country will have its own awareness raising campaigns. Opportunities for outreach will be sought at various relevant national, regional and international events.

Component 2: Both Outcome 2.1 and Output 2.1.1 have been modified. While there are two private international co-financing partners offering their disposal services for dental amalgam wastes, discussion on this topic will occur during the inception phase to finalize the plan for each target country. The infrastructure and services available in each target country are different. Uruguay has national firms that can handle this type of wastes (decontamination facility) while Senegal and Thailand have minimum number of separators in country and are in the beginning stages of tracking their mercury wastes from dental clinics. The cost effectiveness and efficiency of national vs international vendors will be evaluated under this component for specific country context. Sanitary landfill is not an option for final disposal under the Minamata Convention therefore it will not be considered under the project. The project will, however, determine the interim storage and final disposal capabilities in each country to ensure proper recycling of mercury for allowable use under the Minamata Convention.

Component 3: Information to be gathered outside the target countries are not specified at this stage. This topic will be discussed during the inception phase of the project. The database to be developed by WHO will contain the most updated information on COP decisions and all reporting requirements under the Convention related to dental amalgam. The repository to be hosted by the Global Mercury Partnership will serve as a knowledge management hub where all the outreach materials will be shared. The two platforms function differently and will target different audiences around the world. Both platforms will help national decision making process on the subject. After the project ends, the database will be maintained by WHO as the oral health lead under the Minamata Convention and the repository to be maintained by the Global Mercury Partnership. The selection of countries (one per region) was also strategic to maximize global replication.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. See comments on Core Indicators.

Agency Response

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 11, 2022: We take note of the responses.

March 17, 2022: Please clarify more on sustainability and scaling up addressing knowledge management and replication to other countries.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

A key design aspect of this proposal has been ensuring its utility and feasibility in terms of providing a tested, evidence based template that can be deployed as part of a global roll out and scale up of dental amalgam phase down. The project will develop standardized guidance, resources and tools to reduce the need, demand and use of dental amalgam, and ensure disposal of dental waste in an environmentally sound manner. Countries outside of the project that seek to plan for, develop and implement a phase down of the use of dental amalgam can use the outputs and lessons learnt of the proposed project and apply accordingly. The Global Mercury Partnership will be involved in the waste management and knowledge management aspects of the project. The Partnership has extensive experience in providing targeted technical assistance to various mercury reduction projects and its network of expertise and broad reaching worldwide audience will also promote greater dissemination and replication of project results. Global replication will be further reinforced by involving and coordinating with the Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP). It is UNEP's main knowledge management partner and has the network, ability and potential to scale up activities with other UN agencies and private sector stakeholders. Collaboration with GGKP will ensure global scale dissemination and long term knowledge management are conducted. National awareness raising and global advocacy to promote the phase down of dental amalgam use will catalyze innovative approaches in improving the quality of life for all prominent dental amalgam user countries. Experiences learned from target countries can be widely applied to other countries both regionally and globally.

In terms of sustainability, various interventions will be executed simultaneously at the national and global levels. The involvement of both Ministry of Health and Ministry of Environment in each project country is key to ensure national ownership and to emphasize the direct risks that dental amalgam and its associated wastes pose to humans and the environment. Appropriate national regulations on the management of dental amalgam and their enforcement will promote sustainability of project interventions. In addition, engagement from the private sector on supplying separators and providing associated trainings in countries, will contribute greatly toward waste management aspect of the project. As part of the national separator purchasing strategy, a sustainability plan will be incorporated to ensure that financial and technical support are in place after project ends.

8. 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 Yes.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

10. 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

May 17, 2022: Comment cleared.

May 11, 2022: Appendix 10 cannot be found in the document section.

March 17, 2022: Yes from technical perspectives. Please attach Appendix 10 as mentioned.

Agency Response

12 May 2022

Appendix 10 has been included as part of the resubmission.

11. 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 Yes from technical perspectives.

Agency Response

12. 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 Yes.

Agency Response

13. Risk. 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 March 17, 2022: Please add COVID-19 risks related to materializing co-financing and environmental risks including in handling mercury-containing wastes.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

COVID19 risks questionnaire is uploaded as a separate document in the Portal. Regarding co-financing, the commitment from co-financing partners have been recently confirmed therefore COVID19 risks related to materializing co-financing is very low.

14. 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

May 11, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022: Please elaborate coordination with other projects and initiatives.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

For coordination with relevant GEF financed projects and other bilateral and multilateral initiatives in the project countries, UN resident coordinator in each country will be notified and informed of project progress and results and vice versa on relevant projects in the target countries. In addition, since WHO has the health mandate under the Minamata Convention and the Global Mercury Partnership has an extensive network of experts and organizations working on the topic, coordination, finding synergies and dissemination of project progress and results are expected to be transparent, consistent and readily available to all interested parties.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

16. 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

May 11, 2022: We take note of the responses.

March 17, 2022: Please address the below points:

- explaining how the project will be informed by relevant projects and utilize them in building knowledge management.
- including a list of the knowledge products by this project (with timelines and budget as appropriate).
- clarifying how the lessons learned and best practices will be shared and utilized (and mechanisms) within and outside participating countries.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

The project will engage both the Global Mercury Partnership and the Green Growth Knowledge Platform, both have a wide reach of audience through its membership and expertise. The project progress and results will be reported regularly to its members and mutually, information from other relevant projects will be shared with the proposed project as well through the Partnership and Platform. In addition, the project will organize an expert group meeting to update and participate in international meetings and conferences to share experiences. Lastly, there will be two global databases (one public and the other with restricted access) focusing on oral health to be developed through the project by WHO. Information collected through the proposed project and globally will inform other countries that are interested in phasing down dental amalgam. All these venues will promote exchange and building of knowledge on the dental amalgam issue.

In terms of a list of knowledge products to be produced by the project, most of them will be produced during year 3 (last year) of the project. This will include the creation of a variety of products such as publications/briefs at both global and national levels, factsheets, flyers, videos, use of social media, school and clinic/hospital based educational initiatives. Advocacy materials and guidance for Ministries of Health will be translated into other UN languages. In addition to the database mentioned above, knowledge materials will also be housed in a newly created web-based knowledge repository within the Global Mercury Partnership for dissemination and exchange of information and expertise at the global level. Both the repository and the database will serve as mechanisms to share lessons learned and best practices on phasing down dental amalgam.

Main products and associated budget are planned as below:

- Publications in technical journals at the global level (\$20,000)

-Publications in technical journals at the national level (\$17,000)

-Advocacy materials in different UN languages: flyers, factsheets and videos (\$25,000)

17. 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 Yes.

Agency Response

18. 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 Yes.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2022: Comment cleared.

May 31, 2022: Clarification has been made on the project coordinator who is charged to PMC but not to components. Travel Project Coordinator has been corrected. Please correct the format of budget lines on supply and equipment for further assessment.

May 23, 2022: On the budget, please address the below two points.

1. Although a Project Coordinator has been charged to the PMC, a Technical lead and a Travel Project Coordinator have been charged across the components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 944 K, but mainly represented in-kind. Clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval.

2. Operational cost and equipment such as computers and software should be charged to the PMC.

March 17, 2022: On budget table, please add who handles each budget line. Please explain the rationale and details of costs of meetings as they are higher than other

projects. Please clarify the role of the financial officer on PMC who may be the only PM for this project.

Agency Response

3 June 2022

The format of budget lines on supply and equipment have be corrected.

25 May 2022

1. Terms of Reference for the Technical Lead is provided as part of the re-submission. Please kindly note that Travel for Project Coordinator is not a position but related to travel costs of the project coordinator under the components, therefore, the description of the budget line is slightly modified for clarity purposes.
2. Operational costs and equipment are charged to components of the project because they are planned for expert use during field visits and meetings in target countries. The description of the budget lines are modified to reflect their uses.

7 April 2022

There is only one executing agency on the project therefore the majority of the budget will be managed by WHO. However, the global mercury partnership will be responsible for the waste management and knowledge management aspects of the project (components 2 and 3), therefore, approximately \$190,000 will be used for these purposes.

The subregional workshops include travel support for 4 neighboring countries that are outside of the target countries (2 delegates per country). This is planned to support regional dissemination of project interventions and results. The expert working group meeting is planned in Geneva therefore higher DSA allotment are expected. The kickoff meeting location is undetermined at this time due to COVID restrictions in different countries, therefore, higher costs are calculated to anticipate a meeting in Geneva to cover all potential costs.

The financial officer post covers all tasks related to administration, recruitment and financial reporting, therefore, this post will assist the WHO Project Coordinator (title changed from previous submission) to handle all the national and international contracts and organization of various meetings for the project. Both the WHO Project Coordinator and Financial Officer will be charged against PMC.

20. 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

May 11, 2022: Technical comment cleared.

March 17, 2022: ESS sheet is provided. Please fix the format on the portal.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

The format of the ESS information on the portal has been revised.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

May 11, 2022: We note the revised OFP letter.

March 17, 2022: The OFP of Uruguay is different from the one in the LoE. Please obtain a new letter.

Agency Response

A new Letter of Endorsement from Uruguay is attached to the re-submission

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

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 9, 2022: All comments cleared.

June 7, 2022: Please address the comment on co-financing category, which has not been addressed yet.

May 23, 2022: Previous comments cleared. Please address the two boxes above on the co-financing and the budget.

May 11, 2022: Please see the remaining comments above.

March 17, 2022: Please address comments above.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/17/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**1SMSP CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review (as
necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations