

Rehabilitation and restoration of ecosystems in the Gum Arabic belt and sustainable use of forest resources in Mauritania

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11551
Countries
Mauritania
Project Name
Rehabilitation and restoration of ecosystems in the Gum Arabic belt and sustainable use of forest resources in Mauritania
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
6/19/2025
Review completed by PM
7/21/2025
Program Manager
Jean-Marc Sinnassamy
Focal Area
Land Degradation
Project Type
FSP

PIF
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

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

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The summary responds to the different criteria, except its length (875 words, 2 pages versus 250 words or 1/2 page).

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

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

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

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

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2025

Addressed.

July 03, 2025

- Under Output 4.2.2, please ensure that good practices in empowering women and advancing gender equality in the project are produced and widely disseminated.

- Under Outcome 5.1, please ensure also that lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment are monitored and regularly reported on (including in PIRs, MTR and TE).

- The result framework is robust and reflects the ToC. cleared.

- The subject of addressing gender issues was a point raised by the STAP. The project team reflected it in the ToC and considered different ways to strengthen female participation. Gender dimensions are mainstreamed in the formulation of outputs, especially 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.2.2, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 4.2.1, and 4.2.2, well reflecting the role of women in gum arabic and NTPF value chains. Cleared.
- pmc represents 5% of the GEF used for technical components. cleared.
- The ratio GEF/cofinancing is 1:1.7 of the technical components, 1:1.4 for the pmc. and 1:1.6 for the GEF project grant: 1) would it be possible to increase the level of cofinancing that is relatively low and 2) increase the cofinancing contribution to pmc?
- If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%; for a co-financing of \$8,635,014.00 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$431,750.00 instead of \$364,986.00 (which is 4.2%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

		Sub Total (\$)	5,075,669.00	8,635,014.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ				
	GET	253,783.00		364,986.00
	Sub Total(\$)	253,783.00		364,986.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	5,329,452.00		9,000,000.00

Agency Response

1. This has been adjusted in the Output 4.2.2. wording, in the prodoc.
2. The wording in Output 5.1.1. has been updated to reflect this.
3. Currently, the level of co-finance that can be implemented in close alignment with the GEF8 project cannot be increased. However, the MEDD and FAO will work towards mobilizing additional finance during the implementation, especially with regard to engaging small-holder farmers (NTPFs producers), who will also contribute their own money to project activities, however, this cannot be captured in co-finance letters at this stage.
4. Thank you, this is addressed now, co-finance contribution to the PMC is increased
5. The GEF contribution has now been decreased and the co-finance proportion increased, for both contributions to be proportional.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2025

Addressed.

July 03, 2025

- Project rationale and Project description sections have both more than 40 pages combined, when the expected is between 3 to 5 pages. Please revise.
- There is a description of stakeholders, from the national and regional institutions to local actors, including community-based organizations, the private sector (NTPF processors), cooperatives, and microfinance institutions. cleared.

Agency Response¹. These sections have been reduced. Relevant information has been added into a Baseline Annex (Annex Z), and has been referenced accordingly in the main project document.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

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

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- The MEDD will act as the main executing agency.
- FAO is the GEF agency providing project cycle management and support services covered by the fees.
- No agency execution support considered.
- Coordination with other projects involving the MEDD should happen, as the SURAGGWA.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**
 - b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**
- Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2025

Addressed.

July 03, 2025

- The project is rated "moderate" in the prodoc and the Project Risk Certification. An Environmental and Social Management Framework will be finalized. Please, tell us the status of the ESMF.
- On Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that FAO attached ESMS screening document, and stakeholder engagement plan with grievance mechanism. The project is classified as Moderate risk.
- Please provide Environmental and Social Management Framework to address potential environmental and social impacts with budget and timeline.

Agency Response

1. Kindly refer to ESMF Annex re-submitted.
2. Kindly refer to ESMF Annex, including budget and timeline.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, LD1 (SLM) and LD2 (Restoration).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, the project has identified the targets 1, 2, 10, 20, and 23 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Associated outputs have been identified.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2025

Addressed.

July 03, 2025

- On stakeholder engagement: Located the SEP in annex J. The SEP is ok but in the portal risk table the stakeholder risk rating is low. Please ask agency to justify and provide more details on the identified risks, including engagement with all involved NTFP stakeholders.

Agency Response

The risk rating has been updated and more detail on risk and mitigation measures included in ProDoc.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2025

- Informal translation for the five letters are available in the Documents Tab.
- The change from "recurrent expenditure" to "investment mobilized" for two cofinancing letters is a request from me: these two cofinancing come from projects financed by GCF and WB.

Addressed.

July 03, 2025

- All letters of cofinancing are in French. Please, provide informal translation of these letters in English.

- All cofinancng is considered in-kind and as recurrent expenditures. It is potentially disputable for at least two letters:

o The SURAGAWA project is financed by the GCF and may be considered as a grant and as investment mobilized. Please, complete and/or justify.

o The cofinancing brought up by the PRAPS II may also be considered differently as grant and investment mobilized. Please, complete and/or justify.

- In the text under the confirmed cofinancing, you made reference to USD 10.3 million in cofinancing while there are evidences for 9 million of USD. Please, correct.

Agency Response

1. Thank you, all letters have been informally translated and are now uploaded to the portal.
2. Thank you, adjustments have been made in the ProDoc.
3. Thank you, addressed in prodoc and portal, the correct figure for which tangible co-finance letters were collected is 9 MUSD.

Annex B: Endorsements

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP at PIF level.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

- 8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 21, 2205

Addressed.

July 18, 205

When you open the "review" version of the portal, the annex is indeed fine. It is the pdf version that shows the problem.

We alerted IT portal team about this concern on the Annex C, pp 57-71. Please, check with them to sort out the issue.

July 03, 2025

Project results framework:

- The column for ?Means of Verification? is currently being cut off, which may affect readability in the CEO Endorsement Request PDF (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted) page 70. Please adjust the formatting so that all columns are visible, and the table fits well within the margins of the document.

ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Please indicate the page number in the Project Document where the project results and M&E frameworks can be found. Please also paste below the Project Results Framework from the Agency document.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification
Project Objective: The objective is to combat land degradation through the restoration, sustainable management and use of agro-silvopastoral services as well as strengthened sustainability of restoration activities through value chain development of Gum Arabic and other NTFPs.					
Component 1: Creating an enabling environment for sustainable management of agro-silvopastoral landscapes in the Gum Arabic Belt.					
Outcome 1.1: Integrated land-use and agro-silvopastoral management planning capacities are developed and tools broadly used by local (CBOs)					
Output 1.1.1: One national operational manual on the development of gender-responsive integrated land use and agro-silvopastoral management plans (LUPs), with a focus on Gum Arabic and selected priority NTFPs for the wilayas in the Gum Arabic belt developed and validated	1.1.1.1: One national operational manual on gender-responsive integrated land use and agro-silvopastoral management in the Gum Arabic Belt developed and validated	Existing land use plans are developed in a fragmented manner with little consolidation of lessons-learned from previous experience, and do not take into account dynamics of integrated ecosystem restoration, including economic potential and gender-responsive aspects aiming to ensure inclusion of women	Stocktaking and lessons-learned report of current land use planning and agro-silvopastoral management approaches, highlighting different case studies, and providing technical guidance to inform the development of the national operational	One operational manual, validated and available to all Gum Arabic Belt wilayas through an inclusive process.	Technical reports, planning approach process Publication, dissemination, National Operational

- This LD project includes usual core indicators for a LD project:

o 61,000 ha of restored forests under 3.2 and 20,000 ha of restored grasslands under 3.3);

- o 61,000 ha of production systems under SLM under 4.3 gains in carbon, CI 6);
 - o 600,000 tons of CO2e of carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in AFOLU.
- The Core Indicator 11 completes the list with 100,000 beneficiaries, including 50% of women and 50% of males.

Agency Response

21 July 2025

We have adjusted the table formatting. Kindly confirm proper visualization now.

Earlier revision

Kindly note that we checked and from our end (also when clicking on 'review' in the portal, it is clearly and fully visible). Kindly let us know if this visibility challenge from your end has been resolved please. Thank you!

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Coordinates and available.

Two maps are available in the project document (Annex E).

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 01, 2025

Addressed.

July 23, 2025

- Quality Control: There is a new budget line namely 'Operational Support' that as it is presented in generic terms, is not an eligible expenditure - only positions such as Financial Assistant or similar are eligible expenditures. We note that in the previous version, there was an 'Administrative and financial officer', but its cost was only \$69,000. Please ask the Agency to amend by presenting a position and reducing its cost to the original value of \$69,000 or to better explain why the increase in the cost (note: TORs for the position will be needed).

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	GEF	Compon ent 1	Compon ent 2	Compon ent 3	Compon ent 4	M&E	PMC	GEF	RESPON BLE PART
					Total	Total	Total	Total				
5013 Consultants												
International Land Restoration expert(s)	Day	60	600	36,000.00	-	36,000	-	-	0	-	36,000	MEDD
International NTFP value chain expert	Day	60	600	36,000.00	10,800	-	25,200	-	0	-	36,000	MEDD
International micro-finance expert	Day	60	600	36,000.00	-	-	36,000	-	0	-	36,000	MEDD
Sub-total international Consultants				108,000	10,800	36,000	61,200	-	-	-	108,000	
National Technical Project Coordinator	Month	60	4,000	240,000.00	60,000	60,000	30,000	60,000	0	30,000	240,000	MEDD
Operational Support	Month	60	2,500	150,000.00	-	-	-	-	0	150,000	150,000	MEDD
2 National consultants - site coordination and monitoring at wilaya level	Month	120	400	48,000.00	-	48,000	-	-	0	-	48,000	MEDD
National Land Restoration expert	Month	60	2,200	132,000.00	-	132,000	-	-	0	-	132,000	MEDD
National microfinance expert	Month	6	2,200	13,200.00	-	-	13,200	-	-	-	13,200	MEDD
National Non-Timber Forest Product value chains & business plan expert	Month	16	2,200	35,200.00	7,040	-	28,160	-	0	-	35,200	MEDD
National knowledge management expert	Month	30	500	15,000.00	-	-	-	15,000	0	-	15,000	MEDD
National GIS expert	Day	60	150	9,000.00	-	9,000	-	-	0	-	9,000	MEDD
M&E Officer	Month	60	850	51,000.00	-	-	-	22,750	28,250	-	51,000	MEDD
Gender and Safeguards Officer	Month	60	850	51,000.00	10,200	25,500	15,300	-	0	-	51,000	MEDD
Special topic resource persons for APFS	Day	25	150	3,750.00	-	3,750	-	-	0	-	3,750	ASD, ODPCL, Sud Conseil, AGEDP, Voix de l'Espoir,

July 18, 2025

Addressed. Thanks.

July 03, 2025

Budget:

- Support the PM view that PMC should cover the ?Chief Technical Advisor? (CTA) administrative and management tasks.
- In addition to the CTA a ?National Project Coordinator? is being charged to PMC. These positions have many managerial overlapping tasks. Most non-UN Agencies only have one person in the Managerial/Technical position as the responsible of the project. Please ask the Agency to merge these two positions into one or clearly separate the TOR with unique tasks.
- Acknowledge the PM's comment approving the request to purchase of 6 motorbikes, including maintenance and fuel.
- Responsible parties should be identified at this stage.

Special topic resource persons for APFS	Day	25	150	-	3,750	-	-	0	-	3,750	LOCAL NGO
Master Trainer for APFS	Day	90	250	-	22,500	-	-	0	-	22,500	LOCAL NGO
Senior Master Trainer for APFS (x2)	Day	90	400	-	36,000	-	-	0	-	36,000	LOCAL NGO

Training on gender-transformative approaches (eg. DIMITRA, ESS, PSEA etc...) of national and local authorities	Works hop	4	3,000	12,000	-	-	0	-	12,000	LOCAL NGO
Training on gender-transformative approaches (eg. DIMITRA, ESS, PSEA etc...) at community-level	Works hop	48	1,000	48,000	-	-	-	-	48,000	LOCAL NGO

- We acknowledge and clear the request to purchase six motos + maintenance and replacement costs.

- Staff: we take note that the Chief Technical Advisor is 100% financed by technical components. However, his terms of reference also reflect administrative and management activities (contribute to project documentation, support workplans, budgets, procurement, and reporting to the steering committee...): technically, a certain percentage of the CTA should be covered by pmc.

- We are seeing that the project national coordinator and the administrative assistant are both covered by pmc. The terms of reference of the project national coordinator offer a mix of technical and administrative/management activities.

- On the budget table, the two most expensive positions namely Chief Technical Advisor and National Project Coordinator have overlapping responsibilities (see TORs). Several Implementing Agencies have only one top Managerial position that carries out managerial and technical responsibilities ? this is in observance to the provision included in the Policy on Minimum Fiduciary Standards, that call to ensure that development financing is used for intended purposes with economy and efficiency. In our opinion (PO), this principle is not well reflected with these two proposed positions. Additionally, there are several high-level technical experts that can contribute with inputs to the technical issues that Management may need. Please Ask the Agency to consider merging these positions.- Spot checks: We understand that FAO and PO agreed on the nature of these "spot checks" and agreed to assign them to M&E. cleared.

- Consultants: International and national consultants respectively represent 8% and 10% of the project grant.

- International travel: please, confirm this item covers international travels of the international consultants (and not eventual international flights of the PMU).

Agency Response

30 July 2025:

Kindly note that an Operations and Finance Expert will be engaged for the timely delivery of the project. The budget table has been updated and integrates the correct language (in lieu of the generic operational support language). Also, TORs for the Operations and Finance Expert can be found in Annex L of the project document (updated annex). There has been a change since the first submission, due to continued negotiations with project partners. A more junior admin expert was initially envisaged, though capacity gaps of the operational partner did

highlight a need to engage operational and financial support specifically for the project execution. Therefore, an updated profile was agreed upon, with updated TORs and a higher budgeted cost.

Earlier review:

1. Thank you, the position of CTA has been deleted, and the National Project Manager role expanded to include technical and managerial activities, see revised TORs please. Thus, the NPC is funded under the PMC and the technical components, in alignment with GEF policies.

2. To ensure technical support to the NPC, where needed, the number of days of the IC NTFPs has been slightly increased.

3. Thank you.

4. The NGOs that will be engaged under this project include ASD, ODPCL, Sud Conseil, AGEDPEM, Voix de l'Espoir, AU SECOURS, AEV, INTAJ, OMD. These NGOs are usually contracted for these assignments and will be contracted as per their availability as per the project implementation plan.

5. Thank you, the CTA position has now been deleted.

6. The TORs have been adjusted to clearly distinguish the role between the NPC and the assistant, which can provide admin support but will focus mostly on operations and financial tracking, as per the updated TORs.

7. The positions have been merged. There is now one technical NPC, who will manage the project implementation, while also guiding the project technically.

8. Balance slightly shifted due to deletion of the CTA.

9. Confirmed.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 01, 2025

All comments are addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

July 23, 2025,

See the comment from the Quality control about the budget: a change was made that was not discussed and is not eligible. Please address it.

July 21, 2025

Addressed, the project is recommended for clearance.

July 18, 2025

All points are addressed, but one. Please, check the annex C on the pdf version (not the "review" version") and see with IT portal team. Upon confirmation it is solved, the project will be recommended for clearance

July 03, 2025

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the points above.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/3/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/18/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/23/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/1/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		