



# Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11509

**Countries**

Brazil

**Project Name**

Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA

**Agencies**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

4/2/2024

**Review completed by PM**

4/6/2024

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

GBFF

**PIF**  
**CEO**

**1. General Project Information**

**a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners? b) Are the project tags properly selected, i.e. any tag on 'support to IPLCs' or KMGBF target is justified given the project description.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/19/2024

**c) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected with corresponding CCM, CCA, BD and LD benefits made explicit in the project objective, log-frame and/or theory of change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

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 and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

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) **For multi-Trust Fund projects with GEFTF financing, are the GEFTFT Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for projects with GEF project financing less than or equal to \$2 million) or 5% (for projects above \$2 million)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Please specify the sub-granting procedure more clearly and list the criteria that will be used when providing subgrants to IPLCs.

4/23/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

Thanks for this comment. Sub-granting procedure and selection criteria have been more clearly described in the Project Description section, in the Output 3.1.2. description.

**Project Outline**

**4. CHANGES COMPARED to PPG REQUEST**

- 4.1 Are changes to the project design, including to elements put forward in the PPG request to meet GBFF selection criteria, been described and justified. And are they acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

## **5 B. 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 other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is a blended finance project under GBFF Action Area 4, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

## Agency Response

### **6 B. Project Description**

- 6.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (a narrative and a diagram) 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 previous and ongoing investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described, proposed solutions, critical assumptions, and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other 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 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)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, IPLCs, private sector, CSOs) 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 descriptions?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communications adequately described?**
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations, or subsidies been identified that could**

counteract the intended project outcomes? How will that be addressed?

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

**m) For blended finance project only, is the financial structure adequately explained?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**6.2 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 initiatives (e.g., government, other bilateral/multilateral ).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**6.3 GEF Core indicators and GBFF indicators**

**a) Are the identified GBFF and relevant GEF 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 GBFF indicators, relevant GEF core indicators, and additional listed outcome indicators) reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/202

Please add METT Score for any PA under indicator 1.2. If this is not possible, please identify the plans to produce the METT baseline score as soon as possible during project implementation, and then report it during the first PIR.

Please ensure that emissions avoided are outside AFOLU sector as indicated by selecting indicator 6.2 and not within AFOLU, in which case 6.1 should be used.

Please include the anticipated start year of GHG accounting and duration of accounting directly under the related indicator, and as is already outlined in the text field explaining the methodological approach used.

4/23/2024

Cleared

#### Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

1) Thanks for your comment. Target METT scores for all the PA under indicator 1.2 have been completed in the Core Indicator Table and in the Core Indicator Reporting Table (uploaded in the Portal as a CEO ER supporting document).

2) Thanks for this comment. Emissions avoided by this project are, indeed, in the AFOLU sector. This mistake has been corrected, Indicator 6.1 has been selected and anticipated start year and duration of GHG accounting has also been included. This is corrected in the new Core Indicator Table uploaded in the portal as a supporting document.

#### 6.4 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

4/6/2024

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### 7 C. Alignment with Programming Strategies, Country/Regional Priorities

**7.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with the GBFF Action Areas and, for MTF projects, with Focal Area objectives?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the project aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, National Biodiversity Finance Plans, and/or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities. For MTF projects, is the project aligned with other relevant country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and relevant sectors)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**7.3 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  
4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**8 D. Policy Requirements**

**8.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**8.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Please upload the Gender Action Plan to the portal.

As per GEF Guidance, and in light of Target 23 of the GBF, gender equality considerations need to be mainstreamed throughout the project. Please ensure meaningful women's participation in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 3.1.2.

In component 4, KM, please ensure to capture and disseminate good practice and lessons learned from a gender perspective. Under M&E ensure that gender dimensions are monitored and reported on, and the GAP is budgeted.

4/23/2024

Cleared

Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

Many thanks for this comment. The Gender Action Plan has now been uploaded in full in the portal. The project description has been enhanced to more explicitly address gender considerations in alignment with the Gender Action Plan. Particular emphasis was placed on delineating gender-related aspects and women's participation within outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, and 3.1.2, as well as within the KM and M&E sections. The GAP is now referenced in the M&E section.

**8.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**8.4 IPLCs:**

- a) Has the amount of GBFF project financing to support actions by IPLCs been sufficiently justified and have changes compared to PPG request stage, if any, been adequately justified?**
- b) If applicable, does Section C 'Project Description' describe the IPLCs who will benefit from the**

**project and detail their role in the project? Have appropriate project tags related to IPLCs been selected?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**9 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**9.1 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?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Please embed budget within the portal as required.

The budget asks for GEF to purchase 7 vehicles which is a very high number. Please provide further justification for this number of vehicles and seek cofinancing to at least share the costs of this expenditure.

The fire-fighting equipment appears quite rudimentary in nature, can you please clarify what the current approach to firefighting is and what this additional equipment will complement to assess whether this is sustainable.

The cost of PA Council Meetings (US \$2,025,000) accounts for 22,5% of the total GEF financing ? we only found the following explanation in the budget table: *?Support to PA Council meetings: 3 meetings per year per PA?* ? however, there was no explanation in the project?s narrative. This seems extremely expensive and takes up a large portion of the budget with no real justification. Please explain what these meetings entail, justify the large expenditure, and break down the costs included in this estimate.

Considering that the M&E Budgeted amount in the Project Description Overview table is US \$150,000, please breakdown the activity ?EA Targeted Assistance? for US \$426,868, which is charged to M&E. If this activity belongs to M&E, adjust the figure in the Project Description Overview table.

Please fill out the column ?Responsible partner ? Executing Entity receiving the funds from the GEF Agency?.

4/23/2024

Cleared

## Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

Many thanks for the comments. The budget has been embedded within the portal.

Regarding the purchase of the vehicles, PAs to be supported by the project have hardly received any investment, with the majority not having PA Councils formed or active, no PA management plans elaborated, and lacking equipment and infrastructure. In addition, most areas are large and not easily accessible. Hence the request to purchase approximately 1 vehicle per PA. While PA management agencies lack investment resources, they will provide maintenance support once the project ends, ensuring that project investments are sustainable. Of the 9 project beneficiary PAs, currently, only 1 has a viable dedicated vehicle, the rest of the PAs don't have vehicles. This is a barrier for the PA management teams to perform their duties that could compromise the execution of the project. Without those vehicles, the project won't be able to deliver activities such as PA demarcation, patrolling, monitoring and other essential PA management activities. This has been added to the budget footnote.

Regarding the current approach to fire-fighting, there is no proactive activity on this in the PAs. The project will adopt Integrated Fire Management (IFM), an environmental management strategy adapted to each local context, which aims to reduce the conditions for the occurrence of large forest fires, and restore the ecological role of fire in ecosystems and vegetation that evolved with fire. IFM uses controlled or prescribed burning with the dual function of avoiding and/or reducing the severity and intensity of forest fires, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity, and, at the same time, integrating sociocultural aspects and economic aspects of fire management in a given territory. The IFM approach requires some basic equipment, such as backpack blowers, shovels, etc, which is not at hand at these PAs and so is included in the budget. One key aspect of the IFM is training and capacity building, also to be supported by the project, in addition to the provision of the necessary equipment for conducting those activities. As such, provision of this basic equipment, plus training, provided by the project will lead to continued use of the IFM approach post project close.

PA Councils contribute to the preparation and implementation of PA Management Plans; offer transparency for PA management through social control; and integrate PA management with communities, the private sector, research institutions, NGOs, public authorities, as well as other PAs located nearby, directly contributing to the management of the PA. Regarding the PA Council Meetings' budget, an error in the calculation was identified and corrected. At least 3 Council Meetings are recommended to be conducted within each PA per year, with a

total annual cost of approximately USD 15k per PA. This amount covers transportation, meals, accomodation and meeting logistics, including a facilitator/moderator as needed. This totals USD 540k for all 9 PAs for the duration of the project (4 years). The budget was adjusted accordingly, and text added to the project's strategy narrative. In addition, the remaining balance was redistributed to other budget categories under 1.2.1 (activities for PA management) that had been allocated insufficient funds (such as PA equipment, fire management equipment and training) .

With regards to EA Targeted Assistance activity, which sub-totals as \$426,868, this activity is not charged to M&E, but to the different technical components of the project. The M&E budget remains USD150,000, the same as in the Project Description Overview table.

"Responsible partner" column has now been filled out.

#### **9.2 Source of Funds**

**If using GEFTF resources, 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

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

#### **9.3 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type:**

**Noting GBFF does not require but encourages co-financing, 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

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

#### **Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**9.4 a) Have the GBFF indicators and relevant GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; are the targets appropriate for the 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

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Please embed a project logframe in a format that is more legible in the portal.

4/23/2024

Cleared

Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

Thanks. A project logframe with a bigger letter size has been embedded in the portal.

**Annex D: Status of utilization of PPG**

**9.5 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

4/6/2024

PPG: while in the financial Tables there is a request for PPG (US \$100,000) + associated PPG Agency Fee (US \$9,000) [see screenshots below], in the Project information there is none ? please revise.

## Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Was a Project Preparation Grant requested? **true**

PPG Amount (\$) 100,000  
 PPG Agency Fee (\$) 9,000

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	93,675	8,430	102,105.00
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	6,325	570	6,895.00
<b>Total PPG Amount(\$)</b>					100,000.00	9,000.00	109,000.00

<b>Project Title:</b>	Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA		
<b>Region:</b>	Brazil	<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	11509
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Brazil	<b>Type of Project:</b>	GBFF
<b>GEF Agency(ies):</b>	WWF-US	<b>GEF Agency Project ID:</b>	G0056
<b>Project Executing Entity(s):</b>	The Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO)	<b>Project Executing Type:</b>	GEF Agency
<b>GEF Focal Area (s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>Submission Date :</b>	4/2/2024
<b>Type of Trust Fund:</b>	GBFF	<b>Project Duration (Months):</b>	60
<b>GEF Project Grant: (a)</b>	8,964,220.00	<b>GEF Project Non-Grant: (b)</b>	0.00
<b>Agency Fee(s) Grant: (c)</b>	806,780.00	<b>Agency Fee(s) Non-Grant: (d)</b>	0.00
<b>Total GEF Financing: (a+b+c+d)</b>	9,771,000.00	<b>Total Co-financing:</b>	
<b>PPG Amount: (e)</b>	0.00	<b>PPG Agency Fee(s): (f)</b>	0.00

4/23/2024

Cleared

Agency Response

4/19/24

WWF GEF Agency Response:

Thanks for the comment. Table E had been filled, including the total PPG request. There is no other place in the portal to include PPG. Could this be an issue on the back end of the portal?

## Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

11509

Type of Trust Fund

GBFF

Project Title

Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA

Countries

Brazil,

Executing Partner ⓘ

The Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO)

[+ Add Executing Partner](#)

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Agency Fee (\$)

806,780

Taxonomy\* ⓘ

International Waters, Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Biomes, Tropical Dry Forests, Species, Threatened Species, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Livelihoods, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Land Degradation, Land Degradation Neutrality, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Land Cover and Land cover change, Sustainable Land Management, Ecosystem Approach, Sustainable Fire Management, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Stakeholders, Communications, Education, Behavior change, Strategic Communications, Awareness Raising, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination. Partnership. Participation. Gender

Project Type

GBFF

Project Tags ⓘ

GBF Target 4 x

GBF Target 21 x

GBF Target 23 x

Support IPLC x

GBF Target 3 x

GBF Target 22 x

Agency(ies)

WWF-US,

Executing Partner Type

GEF Agency

Duration

60

In Months

Sector ⓘ

Rio Markers ⓘ

Climate Change

Mitigation\*

Significant Object

Climate Change

Adaptation\*

No Contribution C

Biodiversity\*

No Contribution C

Land Degradation\*

No Contribution C

disaggregated indicators, Beneficiaries, Gender-sensitive indicators, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Capacity Development, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Enabling Activities, Knowledge Generation, Training, Learning

31 options selected

Note: In addition to other relevant tags in the taxonomy, all projects need to apply the Rio Markers for Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation

Amount (\$) of GBFF project financing to support actions by IPLCs ⓘ

PPG request stage	CEO endorsement stage
520000	732155

A. Action Area Elements (and Focal Area Elements for Multi-Trust Fund projects) ⓘ

Programming Directions	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
GBFF Action Area 1	Biodiversity	GBFF	8,397,258.00	
GBFF Action Area 2	Biodiversity	GBFF	566,962.00	
<a href="#">+ Add New</a>		<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>8,964,220.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

B. Project Description Overview

Project Objective (max. 200 words, approximately a sentence or two) ⓘ

To improve the conservation of the Caatinga, a biome of global biodiversity importance, through the expansion and improved management effectiveness of Brazil's National System of Protected Areas, endangered species conservation, engagement of Indigenous People, Traditional Peoples and Local Communities, enhancing biodiversity resilience and improving livelihoods.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Creation and improved	Investment	1.1 Creation of New Protected Areas 1.2 Improved management effectiveness of	1.1.1 Desktop and participatory on the ground environmental, socioeconomic and	GBFF	6,970,159.00	

#### D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	GEF Project Grant	Agency Fee(\$)	Total GEF Financing(\$)	
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	Grant	8,397,258.00	755,753.00	9,153,011.00	
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	Grant	566,962.00	51,027.00	617,989.00	
<a href="#">+ Add New</a>						<b>Total GEF Resources(\$)</b>	8,964,220.00	806,780.00	9,771,000.00

#### E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Is Project Preparation Grant requested?

PPG Amount (\$)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

9,000

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	93,675.00	8,430.00	102,105.00
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	6,325.00	570.00	6,895.00
<b>Total PPG Amount(\$)</b>					100,000.00	9,000.00	109,000.00

#### F. Sources of Funds for non-GBFF GEF resources (only for Multi-Trust Fund projects)

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Actual Focal Area Programming	Sources of Funds	Total
<a href="#">+ Add New</a>				<b>Total GEF Resources(\$)</b>	0.00

Save and Validate

Save & Exit

Save & Continue

Cancel

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**9.7 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**9.8 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

4/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Annex H: Blended Finance Relevant Annexes**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

NA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

**10. GEFSEC DECISION**

**10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/6/2024

No, please make the necessary revisions and resubmit as soon as possible.

4/23/2024

Project is recommended for approval.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**10.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	4/6/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/23/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review (as  
necessary)**