



Green and Inclusive Recovery in Mexico (GreenMex): Making high-value ecosystems and rural livelihoods more resilient and sustainable in a post COVID- 19 scenario.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10717

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Green and Inclusive Recovery in Mexico (GreenMex): Making high-value ecosystems and rural livelihoods more resilient and sustainable in a post COVID-19 scenario.

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/30/2022

Review completed by PM

10/16/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Please ensure that once the small protected areas are created by the project, the METT is applied to arrive at a management effectiveness baseline.

Agency Response
15 April 2022

Yes. The METT will be applied once the small protected areas are created.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

The submission includes a letter from the OFP requesting FAO to undertake project execution services. This was not discussed with the GEFSEC prior to submission and comes as a surprise given the considerable technical and operational capacity of CONAFOR, an agency that has experience executing GEF projects.

Furthermore, no costs parameters are included in the letter from the OFP nor is it clear from the presentation and review of the budgets presented by FAO, what these costs will be during the life of the project.

The execution costs cover a wide array of services including hiring of project personnel and consultants, equipment procurement, procurement of rental cars, information gathering and spatial data analysis. All of these activities have been undertaken by the Mexican government agencies in many other GEF projects, thus, please provide a rationale as to why FAO is conducting these functions.

Mexico has considerable experience in information gathering and spatial data analysis in many government institutions, for example, thus this element of the request is particularly puzzling.

4/19/2022

Thank you for your explanation. FAO cannot assume significant operational roles of an Executing Agency (EA) and remain the GEF agency as this creates an unavoidable conflict of interest. As we have noted to FAO in the past, if FAO wishes to assume a significant role as the project EA for a GEF project, then another GEF agency should fulfill the role of GEF agency such that the GEF agency can assume the independent supervisory and fiduciary role.

For example, the ESS and project monitoring functions needs to be managed solely by the EA, otherwise there is a direct conflict of interest with the role of the GEF agency. If these functions reside with the GEF agency and some issue comes up of violating ESS safeguards, the GEF agency cannot play its fiduciary role in assessing the EA's performance since they would be judge and accused at the same time. For other technical functions like the Liaison and Strategic Processes officer, these seem to be an unnecessary additional administrative cost, particularly in a country like Mexico with such significant and demonstrated national capacity to execute projects.

Please note that at most the exceptions GEF allows is for the GEF agency to play a fiduciary role in the procurement of goods and services, the hiring of consultants (who report to the EA), international payments on behalf of the EA when the EA cannot handle dollars in an account from GEF or the like. In cases like Mexico, where there is significant capacity, it is not acceptable for the GEF agency to play a significant technical lead role as is being proposed in the explanation. This simply does not make sense, and it blurs the lines between a nationally-run project and a GEF-agency-run project and undermines the investment in national capacity building that is central to the sustainability of every GEF project.

With regards to next steps, please propose a more reduced fiduciary role as noted in the previous paragraph, assign a clear and transparent cost to these additional costs and resubmit the project along with a new letter from the OFP.

5/18/2022

The submission did not include a letter from the OFP stipulating the execution services that are being asked of by FAO and why these services are needed. Until that is submitted clearly spelling out the FAO role the submission is incomplete. Upon receipt of a revised OFP letter, the new arrangements will be reviewed and assessed.

7/6/2022

The submission includes a letter from the OFP stipulating the execution services that are being requested of FAO.

First, we approve the request related to car rentals and procurement of technological equipment as the justification is satisfactory. Please note that in the letter the total should be \$235,132 not \$235, 131.

Second, the letter includes a request for FAO to perform services related to the mid-term and final evaluations, etc totaling \$203,050. However, there is no justification for this expense and it is unclear why an additional amount is needed when Component Four includes a budget for these activities totaling \$617,442. Why is FAO receiving execution services totaling a third of the total costs of the ME component?

Please revise the OFP letter accordingly and resubmit.

7/20/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

July 14, 2022

Thank you for the comments and review.

The difference between \$235,132 and \$235,131 is due to a rounding issue. The budget has been adjusted to make the totals consistent and equal to \$235,131 as in the letter.

Please note that the \$203,050 do not correspond entirely to M&E budget, but are rather split as follows:

? Mid-Term Review: \$50,000 (M&E)

- ? Terminal Evaluation: \$80,000 (M&E)
- ? Audits: \$45,125 (PMC)
- ? Spot Checks: \$21,375 (PMC)
- ? Terminal Report: \$6,550 (PMC)

By FAO policy and fiduciary standards, evaluations have to be administered by FAO's Decentralized Offices and Independent Office of Evaluation. The purpose is to avoid conflict of interest of EAs evaluating themselves and ensure independence of report and recommendations. In compliance with GEF guidelines to PPC, inputs of the evaluations are charged on project budget while the management of the evaluation process and the QA is paid by agency fees. Similarly, Audits and Spot Checks are administered by FAO to hire a qualified independent audit/accounting firm to assess the financial compliance/performance of the Project Executing Agency, CONAFOR. This fiduciary standard applies to all FAO GEF projects. Both the OFP and GEF PPO are aware in agreement with these FAO policy provisions.

June 10, 2022

Please consider the new submission that includes a letter from the OFP supporting limited execution services and explaining their need. The letter is attached under the documentation section of the GEF portal. The agency has revised the execution arrangements and budget for consistency with the letter. Please note, that as explained in the letter, due mostly to the Austerity law and other national regulations on procurement in the public sector, the national Execution Partner (CONAFOR) faces barriers in the procurement processes of some items, and hence, the request to FAO to carry out these limited support services.

Current restrictions imposed by Federal Austerity Law also have had an impact on the existing vehicles assigned to CONAFOR. Hence, the absence of car rental lines in the project budget would severely impact PMU's ability to travel in the landscapes and may put the achievement of the project's outcomes at risk.

May 16, 2022

FAO has taken this comment into consideration. The agency is now proposing a reduced fiduciary role which now considers the minimum amount of resources in line with the agency rules and procedures with the only exception of the procurement of goods as requested by the government of Mexico.

The point regarding the ESS comment is taken. Please refer to the revised section 11 that foresees adequate mitigation measures.

Kindly note that the Liaison and Strategic Processes Officer has been deleted from the Project Budget as requested.

Please note that CONAFOR will be the technical lead of the Project with FAO providing support as Implementing Agency. The Fiduciary Role of FAO has now been revised. At the request of CONAFOR, and due to cumbersome administrative processes in place in Mexico at the moment, FAO will undertake the procurement of large goods and rentals for travel.

Please refer to the updated budget table in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement request (GEF Portal) and Annex A2 of the attached Agency Project Document. Similarly, the institutional arrangements section has been updated in both documents to be consistent with this approach.

15 April 2022

In line with the items detailed in the OFP's letter of support, kindly find below a detailed explanation of why FAO will undertake selective execution activities:

The execution services provided by FAO will include activities that CONAFOR cannot perform. This is due to the restrictions set up by the current *national regulations for greater efficiency and transparency*. The services to be delivered by FAO are detailed below:

? Hiring of Consultants (Budget Line 5013):

Hiring of a Monitoring and Evaluation Expert, a Climate and Environmental Risk Specialist and Social Safeguards, Gender and Indigenous Peoples Specialist:

- The implementation of other GEF projects in Mexico (e.g. GEF ID 9380) has provided lessons learned about project monitoring and safeguards compliance: both areas should not be the sole responsibility of the executing agency, but also the implementing agency's. This shared responsibility strengthens the segregation of duties between the executing agency (i.e. day-to-day project management) and the implementing agency (i.e. project monitoring and evaluation).

- In the GreenMex project, CONAFOR understands that the M&E team will contribute to more effective, neutral and transparent monitoring of project actions if hired and supervised by FAO.

- Furthermore, the compliance and monitoring of FAO Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) is a minimum fiduciary standard that cannot be delegated to the executing agency, as learned from other projects. CONAFOR has remarkable experience in social and environmental safeguards, but prefers providing timely information to the implementing agency, in order to monitor sensitive risks and implement the project mitigation actions in line with the FAO Environmental and Social Management Guidelines.

Liaison and Strategic Processes Specialist.

The Liaison and Strategic Processes Specialist will provide strategic advice to the project Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) to harness and navigate the enabling environment, rules and procedures, and institutional settings in Mexico. The Liaison Specialist will also facilitate strategic processes, acting as a liaison officer, thus creating a permanent bridge among national Institutions and partners, the Executing Agency and the GEF Implementing Agency. CONAFOR considers that the Liaison Specialist will perform his/her role in a better and more neutral position if hired and supervised by FAO.

Strategic Information Specialist.

This specialist will be responsible for guiding, articulating and aligning activities and outcomes of the GreenMex project with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and government's Programmatic Frameworks. The Strategic Information Specialist will act as focal point for planning and monitoring in compliance with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) in Mexico. This will allow greater visibility and linkage of the project with other projects implemented by the United Nations System and around the achievement of the SDGs.

- Impact Assessment Consultant (Output 1.1.3)

The National Council for the Evaluation of Social Policy (CONEVAL) in Mexico regulates and coordinates the evaluation of policies, programs and actions executed by public agencies. FAO has been generating evidence within the context of GEF, GCF and other projects in recent years and focuses on concrete interventions at the community level, studying the mechanisms that lead project participants to change their behavior towards more sustainable practices.

FAO's Agri-food Economics Division and the FAO's Division for Inclusive Rural Transformation have joined efforts with other international partners to establish a research framework that will gradually improve project design, theory of change, and methodologies and will allow rigorous and effective evaluation of project impacts on socio-economic and environmental indicators, as well as the relationship between them. The GreenMex project is framed within a FAO agenda with the objective to generate knowledge management on biodiversity conservation interventions and policies. FAO's participation ensures that the evaluation approach serves this purpose, enriching global knowledge on the effectiveness of these policies. CONAFOR is interested in making this project a partner in the generation of global public goods.

? Development of tools and methodologies for implementing business models (Beneficiary Grants, output 3.1.2)

The execution of this activity includes grants to direct beneficiaries. CONAFOR's Rules of Operation (RoP) do not allow delivering this kind of direct support. The change of RoPs could last at least 6 months to fulfill its 13 stages. In addition, the GreenMex project amounts allocated for grants is up to USD 2 million. This amount is relatively small for CONAFOR to carry out the entire process of adjusting the RoPs. Due to that fact, the most cost-effective option for a smooth implementation of the project is that

FAO execute directly this activity. The allocation of the grants will include biodiversity criteria, and project results will be part of the feedback for the annual adjustment of the subsequent ROPs.

Car rentals for field activities and mobility expenses and Procurement of technological equipment (computers) for project technical personnel.

During the project preparation phase, CONAFOR stated that there were several barriers on procurement processes that put at risk project execution if it had assumed it directly: a) the restrictions framed in the Federal Austerity Law¹[1]; b) the bureaucratic nature of its current processes to acquire or lease goods such as information technologies and vehicles; and c) that the purchase or lease of investment goods (vehicles and computers), requires the integration in an investment portfolio for each type of goods, which is managed one year prior to their acquisition²[2] before the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit.

In light of the above, CONAFOR considers FAO's direct execution of the following activities as the most cost-effective alternative in the following items:

- Procurement of technological equipment (computers) for project technical personnel. Acquiring goods by CONAFOR in the Information and Communication Technologies (ICT's) category represents a long bureaucratic process that must be authorized by different national public bodies such as the Ministry of Public Administration and the Internal Control Department.
- Car rentals for field activities and mobility expenses. Article 16, Section I of the Federal Law of Republican Austerity prohibits the purchase or lease of vehicles for the transportation and transfer of civil servants, whose commercial value exceeds approximately USD 19,028 (377,320 MXN). This law limits the public institutions to have vehicles with the characteristics that allow access to rural areas. In the same sense, CONAFOR's current vehicle fleet is very restricted and is not enough for the operation of the GreenMex project among the 3 selected landscapes.

A revised OFP's letter of support will be uploaded to the GEF Portal.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/12/2022

No, please address the following:

1. On project information: please request the agency to correct the expected implementation start date to a future date.
2. On Table D: this project shows a 4.5% increase from PIF stage. Please note that amendments ?either minor or major? for projects approved in GEF-7 are not doable at this juncture because the use of GEF-7 financial resources were finalized and consequently informed to the Trustee back in June 2022 (before the end of GEF-7). Therefore, no further GEF-7 funds can be utilized for this project, neither GEF-8 resources can be added to any GEF-7 approved project. Please correct the amount to match what was approved at PIF stage.
3. On M&E: the total, for monitoring and evaluation activities, provided in the overall project budget, in Annex E, does not match the amount provided in the M&E budget in section 9. Please review and correct where necessary.
4. On Council Comments: only the comments from Switzerland and UK were addressed. Please answer/acknowledge the comment from the US and Germany.
5. On the budget:

a. Chief Technical Advisor is part of the project's staff - this position is being charged to project components and PMC. 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. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 503 K, and co-financing for 3.1 million represented in grants - this could be used to cover the costs of the project's staff. Or, provide a TOR for this position showing their work in completing project activities.

b. Charging \$176,386 for the service of car rentals for field activities and mobility expenses is quite awkward as this activity is not normally provided by an Implementing Agency.

- What is included in the Letter of Support signed by the OFP is Car rentals for field activities and mobility expenses for USD 176,385?

We need to understand what FAO's role is in this activity: (i) an intermediary (meaning whether they will contact the rental car office); (ii) the providers (meaning if they will rent FAO's cars to the project); or (iii) both? Please clarify.

c. Charging \$58,747 just for the service of procurement of technological equipment seems to be extremely expensive.

What is included in the Letter of Support signed by the OFP is Procurement of technological equipment (computers) for technical personnel for UDS 58,747?

After reviewing the budget (below), apparently the \$58,747 will be used to purchase the computers, not only for the procurement service. That said, it is unclear what FAO is charging for: (i) the procurement service to buy the computers; (ii) the purchase of the computers; or (iii) both? Please clarify.

d. Please request the agency to charge all M&E related expenses to the M&E budget and not to the components.

e. Please remove the unspecified miscellaneous expenses.

f. The numbers under training do not match. The subtotal +M&E does not add to the overall total.

g. Strategic Support Officer looks as having administrative functions and, therefore, should be charged to PMC.

h. As per guidelines Financial Experts should be charged to PMC. Please clarify whether this position is related to a financial specialist, in which case it has to be covered by PMC.

10/16/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 11, 2022:

1. Point taken. The expected project start date has been corrected to February 1, 2023. The expected end date has been adjusted in line with project duration (5 Years). This change has been done in the GEF portal and attached agency project document.
2. The Project budget has been adjusted in line with the amount approved at PIF stage. Please refer to corrected tables A, B and D in the GEF portal and attached Agency Project Document.
3. Point taken. Please refer to the updated budget in annex E of the GEF portal and the updated Monitoring Evaluation Plan in section 9 of project description. These changes are also reflected on the attached agency project document on the corresponding sections.
4. Point taken. Comments from Canada, US and Germany have now been answered. Please refer to the new edits In Annex B of the GEF Portal and Agency Project Document.
5. 5. Thank you for the comments. Please refer to the following updates to the project Budget. These changes are reflected on annex E of the GEF portal and annex A2 of the Agency Project Budget.
 - a. The Chief Technical Advisor is now charged only to the PMC.
 - b.** FAO's role in the activity related to car rentals for field activities and mobility expenses is acting as an intermediary between the car rental office and the project. The government of Mexico is asking FAO to develop the process of contacting rental car office, asking for quotations and hiring the service. As explained in the OFP's support

for execution letter, due mostly to the Austerity law and other national regulations on procurement in the public sector, the national Execution Partner (CONAFOR) faces barriers in the procurement processes of some items, and hence, the request to FAO to carry out these limited support services. This work will be carried out by FAO without any additional cost to the project.

The budgeted amount \$176,386 corresponds exclusively to the cost of hiring the car rental service with the following assumptions: The Project personnel will move to the field two times per year to each of the 22 project sites. With a weekly rental cost of ~\$ 800 the car rental service for the project reaches is \$ 176,386:

(~\$800 per trip x 2 trips per year x 5 years x 22 project sites)

c. In relation to ?Procurement of technological equipment (computers) for technical personnel?, please note that the \$58,747 correspond to the purchase of 63 computers and 22 projectors which will be used by the project consultants to develop the project activities. Please note that this material is essential. For the following specific activities:

- ? Setting up of forest learning communities (FLCs) at the level of each Bioforestry Corridor
- ? Community monitoring system for NBS strengthened (Output 2.1.4)

This equipment will be transferred to CONAFOR as soon as it is purchased. As explained in the OFP's support for execution letter, due mostly to the Austerity law and other national regulations on procurement in the public sector, the national Execution Partner (CONAFOR) faces barriers in the procurement processes of some items, and hence, the request to FAO to carry out these limited support services. FAO will not charge any amount of money for the procurement service. The budgeted amount corresponds exclusively to the value of the equipment.

d. Monitoring Expenses have been revised and they are now charged only to the M&E budget.

- e. Unspecified miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the budget.

- f. Associated training expenses have been revised so that Subtotal + M&E now adds up to the overall total.

- g. The Strategic Support Officer has been removed from the budget.

- h. The project budget considers a ?Financial-Administrative Specialist? which is charged to the PMC. Additionally, the project considers an ?Access to finance expert? who is not in the Project Management Unit (PMU). This Role is charged to component 3 because, as stated on the projects results framework, this person will be responsible for delivering results from the activities of this component. The role of this person is to provide support in addressing the barrier of small-scale producers not being able to access finance mechanisms (e.g., credits) for sustainable production. To clarify this issue, the name has been rephrased as ?Credit Access expert?.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

NA.

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
4/8/2022

NA.

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
4/8/2022

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/8/2022

No. Please address issues above related to FAO project execution costs proposal.

4/18/2022

No. Please address the issues noted above with the proposed roles of FAO as a project executing agency.

5/18/2022

No. Please resubmit with the letter from the OFP stipulating the services that the OFP wants FAO to execute along with the rationale for the request.

7/6/2022

No. Please resubmit with the letter from the OFP stipulating the services that the OFP wants FAO to execute along with a justification for the request. The request for execution services totaling \$203,050 for ME activities is not justified.

8/12/2022

No, please address the issues listed in the question on Annexes. Please provide information to clearly separate the actual cost of a good or service procured and the product itself.

10/16/2022

All issues have been addressed. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/8/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations