

# Binational and integrated water resources management in the Mer?n Lagoon Basin and Coastal Lagoons

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10550

**Countries**

Regional (Brazil, Uruguay)

**Project Name**

Binational and integrated water resources management in the Mer?n Lagoon Basin and Coastal Lagoons

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

11/30/2021

**Review completed by PM**

3/22/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) Activity 1.1.2 should be basing the TDA on best available science and data. Please adjust

2) Activity 2.3.2 should be formulated in a way so that it is CLEAR that the SP will be signed at ministerial level. (further as part of the activity description, please mention alignment and opportunities for cross fertilization between this investment and the ongoing EUROSocial Programme.

- 3) Activity 3.2 talks about pilots, but offer no information on what the pilots will be or deliver. Please specify both type of pilot, as well as quantifiable output indicators. Further, please make sure these quantifiable indicators are captured in the Results framework, in table B as well as in the uploaded annex.
- 4) Activity 4.3. Please add "atleast 1% of GEF grant to support IWLEARN activities. "
- 5) Core Indicator table includes very high ratings at PIF stage for sub indicators to CI7. Please explain. Further, if regional development is already at 4 before investment, what is the rationale for the investment??
- 6) Core sub indicator 7.1, is stated to be at 2 already at PIF stage, if this is the case, it seems odd to have component 1 and associated activities included in the investment that will deliver a TDA if it is already finalised. Please explain.
- 7) Core sub indicator 7.2 states that regional legal agreements and regional all ready exists and are well functioning. Please elaborate on this. Further, if this is the case, please explain why the investment is needed and what will be delivered by this investment, that is not already present.
- 8) Core sub-indicator 7.3 states that national and local reforms are implemented and supported by Inter-ministerial committees . As above, please explain the rationale for implementing this investment if the main objective for delivering both functional IMC and full scale implementation of SAP priorities are already taking place. More often than not in regional transboundary investments, getting to the stage of implementing SAP priorities happens in the tail endo fo the investment or in a follow up investment. Such follow up investments may be financed by national ministerial financing, private sector financing, local municipality financing, sometimes in combination with GEF financing.
- 9) Sub-indicator 7.4 also have a high rating at PIF stage (3) which is remarkable as there are currently no GEF IW investments in Laguna Merin. Further, it is troubling that the project is not planning on having project staff and national representatives participate in the IWC, nor providing spatial data. Particular the fact that the project is not planning to participate in the IWC is first of all odd, as the first one planned is currently to be hosted by Uruguay. Moreover, it is problematic as GEF IW financed investments are expected to participate in IWC and regional events organised by IWLEARN. Please strongly consider to change the rating.
- 10) Table 3 outlines GEF projects in the region that the investment will be coordinating with in relation to sharing experiences or synergies. However, please also include externally financed investments, such as the ongoing EuroSocial Programme.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): partly. some issues still pertain.

1) This project is at the stage of CEO endorsement, hence it is expected to be able to provide details on focus of the pilots and the quantifiable deliverables. Hence, please provide. if this is not possible, please insert wording to the effect that both detailed descriptions of the pilots and the specific quantifiable output indicators for the specific pilots and the entire project will be submitted to the GEFSEC within the first year of implementation.

2) There is general confusion on what the TDA is compared to the SAP. It is mentioned that the pilots will be identified through the TDA process. This is odd, as the TDA is to provide a transboundary diagnostic analysis based on best available science, which then will inform a Strategic Action Programme, that will be identifying the areas to be invested in towards ensuring implementing of the SAP priorities. Please make sure that this approach is adopted in the project as well as in the responses in the reviewsheet.

3) The RF now illustrates that the core indicator ratings for core indicator 7 is consistent with the thinking behind the indicator and its sub indicator ratings. However, the core indicators that has been captured in the core indicator table (7.2, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4) is not reflecting on this in a sensible way. All of these sub-indicators goes from a higher rating of achievement at PIF to having a lower level of achievement at the time of CEO Endorsement. Please correct.

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Points 1 and 2 are addressed. For point 3, please note that the figures in a Council-approved PIF cannot be retroactively changed. Instead, please clearly describe in the Core Indicators explanation field in the CEO Document that the PIF figures were entered incorrectly (and why), show the difference between the incorrect PIF figures and the correct PIF figures, and include any other information that may help clarify this issue.

15th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

## Agency Response

### **15th of March 2022:**

Thank you for the comment. As requested, we have entered this explanation into the Core Indicator explanation field in the CEO Endorsement Request form in the GEF Portal and the most updated Agency Project Document (attached under documentation). As indicated in our previous round of responses, the mid-term and final target values given in the Results Framework for each of these sub-indicators represent significant improvements over the baseline.

## **February 14, 2022**

- 1) Text to this effect has been added to the description of Output 3.2.
- 2) Our intention was that the design of the pilots could be further enriched by information compiled and generated through the TDA process, in addition to that compiled during PPG. However it has now been clarified in the ProDoc that the design of the pilots will not be dependent on the TDA process. The workplan in Annex G has also been adjusted to show this.
- 3) Currently, the PIF field in the GEF portal is displaying the end of project targets that were estimated at the time of PIF stage formulation. We understand that this is incorrect and apologize, since the GEF core indicator guidance document states that, instead, projects should report current scores for each of the four subindicators? at each stage of the project reporting cycle (PIF, CEO Endorsement, Mid-Term Review, and Terminal Evaluation)?.

The current (baseline values) that were estimated at PIF stage, which should have been inserted into the PIF field, are 1, 3, 2 and 1 respectively instead of the 2, 4, 4 and 3 that are currently shown.

Unfortunately, the agency cannot update the respective fields as they are blocked on the CEO Endorsement request form in the GEF Portal. The agency will welcome a conversation with the GEF secretariat to correct this issue in the GEF portal.

With this correction, the baseline values estimated at the time of PIF would be the same as those estimated at CEO Endorsement, with the exception of that for Core Indicator 7.3, which decreases from 2 to 1. This reflects the results of PPG analyses, which have given a more realistic picture of the baseline situation than was possible at PIF stage. The target values at Mid-Term and End, as shown in the results framework, are higher than these baseline values, indicating significant expected achievement by the project on all indicators.

## **13 January 2022**

1) Output 1.1.2 has been modified as follows: ?Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis document based on collective and public consultation processes, *and best available science and data*?

Please refer to changes in :

- Table B (page 6)
- Section II. 1a. 3 (Page 40)
- Section II. 1a. 8 (Page 59)
- Annex A.1 Results Framework (page 98)
- Annex G (Work Plan) in Agency Project Document (page 122)

2) Output 2.3.2 has been modified as follows: ?SAP developed and agreed among stakeholders, *and signed at ministerial level*?. An additional paragraph has been added under Output 2.3.2: ?*Given the strong focus of the SAP development process on the involvement of local governments and civil society, this will be closely coordinated with the EUROSocial+ project, which aims at strengthening social cohesion and local governments in the border areas and assessing socio-economic and environmental impacts from a Basin perspective*?. EUROSociAL+ is also referred to in the description of baseline initiatives in both countries.

Please refer to changes in:

- Table B (page 7)
- Section II. 1a. 2 (pages 33 and 34 under paragraph 77)
- Section II. 1a. 3 (Page 46, paragraphs 115-6)
- Section II. 1a. 8 (Page 60)
- Annex A.1 Results Framework (page 98)
- Annex G (workplan) in Agency Project Document (page 101)

3) Please note that the text under Output 3.2.1. does list the issues on which it is expected that the pilots will focus, and Output 3.2.2 is clearly identified as focusing on fisheries and tourism. However, as explained in the text relating to Outcome 3.2, it will be through the TDA, in the initial phase of project implementation, that the priority issues to be included in the pilots will be confirmed, in consultation with basin stakeholders, in order ensure their relevance. It would therefore be premature to commit the project to these specific issues, with corresponding specific output targets, at PPG stage. The end of project indicator for Output 3.2.1 is that ?all of the pilots agreed by

SAP participants [through these processes] have been established, with full participation from local stakeholders?: this commits the project to establishing the pilots but without prejudging the results of the TDA.

4) This has been added to the wording of Outcome 4.3 in Table B.

Please refer to changes in :

- Table B (page 8)
- Section II. 1a. 3 (Page 51, paragraph 141)

5) Please note that target rather than baseline values were erroneously included in the table. The table has now been corrected to include the baseline values given in the project framework of the PIF, and also what our current (CER) assessments are on the basis of PPG analyses.

The baseline values included in the table are shown in red below, together with the target values shown in the PIF Project Framework and the current Results Framework. The target values represent substantial improvements over the baseline, as a result of GEF investment.

	PIF		CER	
	Baseline	Target	Baseline	Target
7.1	1	2	1	4
7.2	3	4	3	4
7.3	2	4	1	4
7.4	1	3	1	4

Please refer to changes in :

- Core Indicators section in the portal

6) Please note that the baseline value assessed at both PIF and CER stages is 1. The value of 2 in the core indicator annex for PIF stage erroneously referred to the target: the table has now been corrected to show the baseline value. The revised target is for an increase from 1 to 4 as a result of GEF investment.

Please refer to changes in :

- Core Indicators section in the portal

7) Strictly speaking, the requirements for a rating of 4 are already met (baseline situation), as the regional agreement has been ratified and the Regional Management Institution (RMI) is functioning; this is however qualified in the results framework by

the clarification that *the legal/institutional basis is underdeveloped and underutilized in making strategic decisions with basin-wide implications?*. There is insufficient leeway in the indicator definitions to permit precision to be included on the effectiveness of application of the legal agreement once ratified, or the level of functionality of the RMI. In view of the above, we have reduced the baseline value to 3.

Please refer to changes in :

- Annex A.1 Results Framework (page 98)

8) Please note that the baseline value given at both PIF and CER stages is 1. The value of 4, erroneously shown in the table, referred to the target (as appears in the results framework).

Please refer to changes in :

- Core Indicators section in the portal

9) Please note that the baseline value given at both PIF and CER stages is 1. The value of 3, erroneously shown in the table, referred to the target (as appears in the results framework). The target has been revised to 4. A new output has been added (4.3.4) referring to participation of the project team in the IWC.

Please refer to changes in:

- Table B (page 8)
- Annex A.1 Results Framework (page 1034)
- Annex F (page 121)
- Table B (page 8)
- Section II. 1a. 3 (page 53)
- Section II. 1a. 8 (page 61)
- Section II. 8 (page 88)
- Section II. 9, Table 5 (page 91)
- Annex A.1 Results Framework (page 104)
- Annex B (Responses to project Reviews - page 118)
- Annex G (workplan - page 127)

10) Reference to EUROsociAL+ has now been included

Please refer to changes in:

- Section II. 1a. 3 (Page 47, paragraph 116)
- Table 3 (page 52)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

however, it is noted that there is a calculation error in the Co-financing letter from ANA. The total should have been 216354, but the letter mentions 216355. But the correct amount of 216354 has been included in the portal entry

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

**13 January 2022**

Please note that the error in the ANA letter is due to rounding, and the correct value is the total of 216,355 that is shown. This has been corrected in the co-financing table of the ProDoc.

Please refer to changes in:

- Table C (page 9)

**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 17th of December 2021  
(cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. Please double check to make sure that there is remaining funds that has not been allocated. If this is the case, these are to be transferred back to the GEF

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response  
**13 January 2022**

Annex C has been corrected. All PPG funds have been either spent or committed.

Please refer to changes in :

- ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): A number of points has been included under review question 2. Please address these

26th of January 2022 (cseverin); Not all addressed yet

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed

## Agency Response

### **13 January 2021**

Please note the explanation provided above, that the values in Table E erroneously represented target rather than baseline values: this has now been corrected, and the target values are shown in the results framework.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the Agency Project Document )

## **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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Maybe, it depends on what what the core indicators will be edited to. If the current indicators remain, it is questionable if the investment makes sense.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Core indicators, as captured in the core indicator table, seems to indicate that the project will decrease the level of transboundary cooperation from PIF ratings to CEO endorsement ratings. Please adjust

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed, per above.

## Agency Response

### **February 14, 2022:**

Please note that we do not expect any project achievement between PIF and CEO Endorsement stage, as the project will not have commenced implementation. As

explained above, the difference between PIF and CEO Endorsement reflects updated assessment based on PPG studies.

### **13 January 2022**

Please note the explanation provided above, that the values in Table E erroneously represented target rather than baseline values. The targets for indicators 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 represent increases in rankings of 3, 1, 3 and 2 levels respectively.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the Agency Project Document )

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. the document includes a strong baseline

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Maybe, it depends on if any adjustments are made to the core indicators.

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed, per above.

Agency Response

### **13 January 2022**

Please note the explanation provided above, that the values in Table E erroneously represented target rather than baseline values.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the Agency Project Document )

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, the incremental reasoning section needs to be outlining what will happen without the GEF increment, compared to what will be achieved with the GEF increment.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

**13 January 2022**

Section II 1a) 5 has been rewritten to contrast more effectively the GEF alternative with the baseline scenario.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the Agency Project Document )

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly

One of the major global environmental benefits to be achieved through the IW Focal Area investments is transboundary cooperation. Such cooperation looks different in each transboundary basin, however, the sub indicators under CI7 are some ways that GEF IW investment measure impact. Therefore, it not easy to understand if the project will deliver any substantial GEBs, as the Core indicators filled in, seem to indicate that the transboundary cooperation is already at a maximum.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Issue persist, please address

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed, per above.

## Agency Response

**February 14, 2022**

Please note explanations given above and in response to the first round of comments: the project is targeted to increase values for core indicators 7.1-7.4 from 1, 3, 1 and 1 respectively to 4, 4, 4 and 4.

**13 January 2022**

As explained above, the project will result in increases of 3, 1, 3 and 2 levels respectively in IW core sub-indicators 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the agency project document)

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please also reflect upon what the delivery of a data sharing mechanism and the deployment of a TDA and SAP will have on Innovation and potential for scaling up

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Addressed.

## Agency Response

**13 January 2021**

Additional explanations have been added regarding the contributions of activities under Output 2.2.2 and Outcome 4.3 to innovation and scaling, as well as the ways in which the TDA will serve to compile knowledge on innovations and replicable practices, and the SAP will make provisions for the continuation of scaling into the future.

Please refer to changes in:

- Section II. 1a. 7 (page 57, paragraphs 165 and 167)

### **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

13th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

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

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, the Annex referred to seem to be a very detailed stakeholder analysis during PPG, whereas the stakeholder engagement plan during implementation does seem to be less well described. Please add this.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

**13 January 2022**

The envisaged roles of each identified stakeholder group in the project, and project strategies/responses to optimize the engagement of each, are presented in Annex H.3.

Further detail, including a stakeholder engagement matrix based on the information presented in Annex H.3, has been included in Section II. 2.

Please see changes in :

- Section II.2 (pages 63-67, paragraphs 179-188)

#### **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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

Please develop and upload a COVID 19 analysis of short and long term impacts and opportunities due to COVID 19.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): addressed sufficiently.

Agency Response

**13 January 2022**

COVID risks and mitigation measures have been added as an additional item to the risk matrix.

Please refer to changes in:

- Section II. 5 (pages 74-77)

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response

**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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

- 1) Please ensure that it is clear that the project will be allocating atleast 1% of the GEF grant to IWLEARN activities, both in the KM section, as well as in Table B
- 2) Please carefully review the IWLEARN sub indicators under core indicator 7. As pointed out earlier it seems impossible that the project already has a delivery of 3 to IWLEARN, before the project starts. Further, if the project is only aiming to achieve 3 during its entire implementation, it is really problematic. This is particular a problem, as this investments was among others to serve to be a show case of transboundary cooperation to used a showcase during the upcoming IWC, which is to be hosted by Uruguay.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): Partly, point 1, has been addressed. point 2 persists.

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

##### **February 14, 2022:**

Please note explanations above. The baseline values are now estimated at 1, 3, 1 and 1, increasing to 4, 4, 4 and 4 over the life of the project.

##### **13 January 2022**

- 1) The budget allocation to IW-LEARN activities has been specified in the text under Outcome 4.3 and in Table B.

Please refer to changes in:

- Table B (page 8)
- Section II. 1a. 3 (Page 51, paragraph 141)

- 2) As explained above, the values referred to were target rather than baseline values. This has now been corrected.

Please refer to changes in:

- Core indicators section in the portal (and Annex F of the agency project document)

#### **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

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response

**Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

29th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) In the Annex E project budget table, please include a column to indicate which entity is responsible for which activities. A project budget template is available on page 46 of the Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy:

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF\\_C.59\\_Inf.03\\_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_C.59_Inf.03_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf)

(2) In the Annex E project budget table, please explain what "miscellaneous including contingencies" entails. Otherwise, please cover these costs through co-financing.

8th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

#### **April 7th, 2022**

(1) Thank you for the comment. The column for responsible entities has been added to the Budget on Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request and Annex A2 of the attached Agency Project Document. Please consider support letters from OFPs in Brazil and Uruguay uploaded to the GEF portal on November 2021 and paragraph 216 of the CEO endorsement Request.

(2) Thank you for the comment. The line "Miscellaneous including contingencies" has been deleted from the Budget on Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request and Annex A2 of the attached Agency Project Document

### **Project Results Framework**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. however, please make sure that there is a strong connection between the Core indicators (especially the revised ones) and the Results framework and the quantifiable indicators.

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

#### **13 January 2022**

IW core sub-indicators 7.1-7.3, which were previously used as objective level impact indicators in the results framework, have been moved down to outcome level (in line with core sub-indicator 7.4).

Reference to objective level indicators has been removed from the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

Please refer to changes in :

- Annex A.1 Results Framework (pages 99, 100 and 101)

- Section II. 9, Table 5 (page 89)

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 17th of December 2021  
(cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 17th of December 2021  
(cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): a bit of funding seems to still be available. Please double check budgets and ensure to refund any funding that may be left.

26th of January 2022 (cseverin: addressed

Agency Response

**13 January 2022**

The PPG table has been revised. No remaining funds are available.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 17th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

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

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 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 NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

17th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

26th of January 2022 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

6th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comment and resubmit. Thank you.

29th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

8th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes, recommended for CEO Endorsement.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

