



Amplifying the impact of the ?Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation? of the Global Environment Facility through learning and knowledge management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11303

Countries

Global

Project Name

Amplifying the impact of the ?Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation? of the Global Environment Facility through learning and knowledge management

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

10/10/2023

Review completed by PM

11/9/2023

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

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
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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

13Nov2023

Cleared.

10Nov2023:

While the mismatch between the figures in the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table for the LDCF was addressed, the lack of SCCF budget table (see below) did not permit determining whether the above mismatch was addressed ? please present the SCCF table for us to assess the alignment in figures between the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table. If the uploading of this image in this location is a challenge in the portal, please indicate this as well as uploaded it in additional locations so as to be certain it is uploaded and visible in the CER as well as supporting documents.

GEFSEC 7Nov2023:

There is still is a mismatch between the figures in the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table. See some few examples below:

Component 1 in Budget table for LDCF: \$110,140
in Table B for LDCF: \$135,459

- Component 1

•Component 2 in Budget table for SCCF: \$90,000
in Table B for SCCF: \$485,067

- Component 2

- M&E in Budget table for LDCF: \$28,028 - M&E in
Table B for LDCF: \$104,229
- M&E in Budget table for SCCF: \$101,229 - M&E in
Table B for SCCF: \$31,028

Please review thoroughly and ensure all the figures are consistent in the different sections.

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

A) Please revise the project objective to as follows, to be more consistent with the rest of the CER: "The project aims to accelerate innovation and private sector engagement in climate change adaptation, by identifying, sharing and disseminating learnings and knowledge generated, including through projects supported by the GEF-managed LDCF and SCCF, particularly projects through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation, in the areas of (i) investment funds, (ii) MSME incubation and acceleration, and (iii) CCA impacts and measures."

B1) For Outcomes 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2, please clarify that all learning activities will be developed by the respective leads for each of the 3 communities of practice (GARI, Climate Kic, UNEP FI).

B2) Regarding Output 1.1.2, please specify that all webpage and other communications activities will be in close coordination with the GEF Secretariate Communications team and staff responsible for the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation, and that this output will include the creation of text, images, and other materials such as brochures for consideration of the GEF Secretariat to include on the GEF website and in GEF communications materials as relevant. We encourage that this include a brochure describing the project and its objectives and partners, in print and electronic form.

B3) Regarding Output 1.1.3, please specify that this will include active social media presence, in close coordination with the GEF Secretariate Communications team and staff responsible for the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation.

B4) Please ensure all acronyms are spelt out the first time they appear in the document (eg. GARI in output 2.1.2, etc.)

B6) Output 2.1.3, 3.1.4, and 4.1.3: Please specify the minimum number of webinars for each community of practice.

B5) Output 2.1.4: this output number is listed twice. Please correct.

B7) Output 2.1.4.; 3.1.5 and 4.1.4: Please clarify these can be a white paper or full journal article to frame the work of the community of practice.

B8) To the text possible and relevant, it would be useful that the learning activities and their numbering are articulated in a consistent across the 3 communications of practice, for clarity and simplicity. As it is, the inconsistency would make it hard to track.

B9) Output 4.1.4: Please clarify if this will involve a white paper or full journal article AS WELL AS a policy brief, or otherwise.

B10) 2.1.4, 3.1.6, and 4.1.5: Please clarify the virtual meetings will be for at least 50 stakeholder each, "on average", in order to provide flexibility if some are more and some are less than 50. Also, please clarify these activities will be in close collaboration with, and as an complementary activity for, ongoing GARI convenings.

B11) Output 2.1.5, 3.1.7: Please clarify these will be blogposts OR other types of articles, to enable flexibility on this. Please also specify that the blogposts or articles will be produced in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat staff responsible for this project, and consider opportunities for co-authoring as relevant. Also, will there be no blogposts or articles for the community of practice on impact metrics, and if so why not?

B12) Output 3.1.3: Include reference to "opportunities", as well as challenges and good practices.

B13) Outcome 4.1: Please indicate what partner will lead this Community of Practice. Do we understand correctly that this will be UNEPFI?

B14) Components 2, 3, 4: Please ensure the leads for each Community of Practice provide active relevant communication efforts for all activities, including presence on their website and social media, in coordination with UNIDO and the GEF Secretariat.

B15) Please ensure all clarifications to the components, outcomes, and outputs, are reflected consistently in all relevant places throughout the document.

B16) For the outputs on engaging participants in the community of practice, as soon as the project begins implementation it will be useful for UNIDO to send a message to all Challenge Program projects implementing and executing partners, informing them of the start and inviting them to self select which of the 3 communities of practice they want to engage in (they could do 1, 2 or all of them). Then, each lead of the communities of practice should also directly reach out to those we know will be strongest sharers of learning for each community, to ensure their active engagement.

B17) Regarding output 1.1.4, please ensure this is developed in close consultation, and consider opportunity for this to be co-authored, with the GEF Secretariat. Please also ensure this study and publication is appropriately shared based on a communication strategy, including at international events and through social media.

C) Yes

D) Yes

E) Yes

Additional related to consistency between project description overview and annex E on the budget:

On the budget: there are differences, in the totals, between the budget provided in Annex E and in the budget table in *Project Description Overview*. Please ask the agency to review and correct where necessary.

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

A) Done, the objective has been revised.

B1) Done, we clarified that GARI, CLIMATE-KIC and UNEP FI will deliver all activities under their respective Communities of Practice.

B2) Done, we inserted the additional text under Output 1.1.2 as suggested.

B3) Done, we mentioned about the social media presence under Output 1.1.3.

B4) Done, acronyms were spelled out.

B5) Done, repetition was removed.

B6) The actual number of webinars will be decided by the respective leads of the Communities of Practice at inception stage. This was highlighted under each output.

B7) These will be a white paper and a policy brief which is the executive summary of the white paper.

B8) The project document was co-created with the leads of the Communities of Practice, Climate KIC has one additional activity that was listed in this position as it follows the logical sequence of the implementation of project activities. For this reason we believe this is the best arrangement of the list of activities.

B9) This includes the white paper as well as the policy brief but no full journal article.

B10) Done, "at least" 50 stakeholders was replaced by "on average" 50 stakeholders and reference was made to the activities being complementary for convenings of the Communities of Practice.

B11) Done. There will be blogposts for the Community on metrics.

B12) Done, reference to "opportunities" was inserted in the list of activities as well as in the body of the project.

B13) Yes, UNEP FI will lead Outcome 4.1.

B14) Done, reference was made to communication efforts promoted by each Community.

B15) Done, all changes have been reflected throughout the document.

B16) Noted, this will be done at inception stage.

B17) Done, reference added under Output 1.1.4.

On the Budget: the annex combines funds from LDCF and SCCF. We have revised it and broken down the budget table by Fund so it is easier to visualize.

UNIDO 8/11/2023

Although the budget file uploaded was correct, the captions of the two pictures showing the LDCF budget table and the SCCF budget table were swapped. This was fixed now, moreover the columns "PCS" and "M&E" have been merged to show total amount for M&E more clearly.

UNIDO 13/11/2023

The budget annex was uploaded under "attachments" in the budget section, also visible under "roadmap/documents". Some of the images inserted under the budget comment section "Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here" were not visible due to a technical issue of the GEF portal. They have now been replaced and should be visible under this comment section too. If not, kindly refer to the attachment "Annex_H_Budget" in the budget section.

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

GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

Cleared

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

A) Yes

B1) With regards to the community of practice on investment funds, for the project on Resilience for Peace and Security, please make reference to Global Resilience Partnership as the executing partner.

B2) This project fits well in the community of practice on impact measures, but likely less so for the other two communities:

"Certification of Climate Change Adaptation Portfolios of Inclusive Financial Service Providers for Scaling Up Climate Adaptation Finance for Smallholder Farmers"

B3) This project is a good fit for enterprise acceleration, but likely less so for the other communities of practice:

"Blended finance facility for climate resilience in coffee and cacao value chains: CC-Blend)
IA: IUCN EE: Nespresso"

"Building Climate Resilience in Supply Chains for the Mobilization of Adaptation Financing
IA: Conservation International EE: Heifer International"

B4)

C) N/A

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

B1) Done, reference to Global Resilience Partnership added.

B2) Done, reference to the project removed from the other Communities.

B3) Done, reference to the project removed from the other Communities.

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

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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
GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

Cleared

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Please clarify in the relevant places of the CER who will lead the community of practice on impact measures, and if this will be UNEPFI.

Agency Response
UNIDO 25/10/2023

Done.

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 Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation assessed and adequately rated?**
- 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
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

Cleared

GEFSec 20Oct2023:

While the scope and objective of the project suggest an important role of civil society organizations and groups, their different roles and responsibilities have not been clearly elaborated on in the project. The SEP includes details on the roles and responsibilities of other key stakeholders. Please include some additional information on civil society organizations, women groups etc that will be engaged in the project implementation.

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

Relevant CSOs and Women groups will engage with the Webpage or the activities of the Communities of Practice depending on their interest. This has been highlighted in the stakeholders table.

7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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 Request

GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

Cleared

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Please ensure sufficient budget for travel of participants in communities of practice to relevant international events for learning, knowledge sharing, and communications purposes.

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

The project will make use of global events happening back to back so that sponsoring of the participants is not needed. Budget was allocated to sponsor participation of some LDCs representatives.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

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 Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

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 Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

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

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

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 Request
GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

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
GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

The comment from UNIDO is well noted.

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

As indicated in the project document under the project results framework, the total number of beneficiaries is 1554 and the number of stakeholders is 50. At the time of submission of the PIF and CEO endorsement, we accidentally inserted twice the number of total beneficiaries (1554 for SCCF and 1554 for LDCF, for a total of 3108) and the number of private sector enterprises engaged (50 for SCCF and 50 for LDCF) as the portal prompted us to insert the number of beneficiaries twice (once for LDCF and once for SCCF). We have corrected the total number of beneficiaries and private sector enterprises by redistributing the total number between LDCF and SCCF.

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
GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

Cleared

GEFSec 12Oct2023:

Please provide physical location of any known knowledge sharing workshops or events, to be held alongside a UNFCCC or other international meeting, or of a capital city where an existing LDCF/SCCF project with an LOE is located that is related to the knowledge sharing activities. We appreciate that some of the international meetings where events will be held have not yet defined the location, but please indicate for any that are known.

Agency Response

UNIDO 25/10/2023

The events below will be relevant for the project activities, however most of the locations are still to be determined. We provide a tentative list for your information:

- COP 29 (location TBD)
- International Vienna Energy and Climate Forum 2025 (Vienna, Austria)
- 8th GEF Assembly (location TBD)
- Regional Climate Weeks (location TBD)

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

13Nov2023:

Cleared.

10Nov2023:

While the mismatch between the figures in the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table for the LDCF was addressed, the lack of SCCF budget table (see below) did not permit determining whether the above mismatch was addressed? please present the SCCF table for us to assess the alignment in figures between the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table. If the uploading of this image in this location is a challenge in the portal, please indicate this as well as uploaded it in additional locations so as to be certain it is uploaded and visible in the CER as well as supporting documents.

GEFSEC 7Nov2023:

As also indicated in the project overview section, there is still is a mismatch between the figures in the Project Description Overview Table and the budget table. See some few examples below:

Component 1 in Budget table for LDCF: \$110,140	- Component
1 in Table B for LDCF: \$135,459	
•Component 2 in Budget table for SCCF: \$90,000	-
Component 2 in Table B for SCCF: \$485,067	
•M&E in Budget table for LDCF: \$28,028	- M&E in
Table B for LDCF: \$104,229	
•M&E in Budget table for SCCF: \$101,229	- M&E in
Table B for SCCF: \$31,028	

Please review thoroughly and ensure all the figures are consistent in the different sections.

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

(Same comment as provided above under project description overview)

Additional related to consistency between project description overview and annex E on the budget:

On the budget: there are differences, in the totals, between the budget provided in Annex E and in the budget table in *Project Description Overview*. Please ask the agency to review and correct where necessary.

Agency Response

UNIDO 8/11/2023

Although the budget file uploaded was correct, the captions of the two pictures showing the LDCF budget table and the SCCF budget table were swapped. This was fixed now, moreover the columns "PC5" and "M&E" have been merged to show total amount for M&E more clearly.

UNIDO 13/11/2023

The budget annex was uploaded under "attachments" in the budget section, also visible under "roadmap/documents". Some of the images inserted under the budget comment section "Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here" were not visible due to a technical issue of the GEF portal. They have now been replaced and should be visible under this comment section too. If not, kindly refer to the attachment "Annex_H_Budget" in the budget section.

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 Request

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9Nov2023:

Recommended for approval.

GEFSEC 7Nov2023:

The is one remaining comment related to alignment of budget amounts.

GEFSEC 6Nov2023:

This project is recommended for technical clearance, pending any further comments from colleagues on policy alignment.

GEFSec 17Oct2023:

Not yet. GEFSEC comments need to be addressed.

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	10/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/9/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/10/2023	