

# Transformation of Colombia's Panela Subsector through the NAMA's Initial Implementation (CPS-NAMA)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9581

**Countries**

Colombia

**Project Name**

Transformation of Colombia's Panela Subsector through the NAMA's Initial Implementation (CPS-NAMA)

**Agencies**

CAF

**Date received by PM**

1/22/2019

**Review completed by PM**

3/26/2021

**Program Manager**

Milena Vasquez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement** **Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: No major changes have been presented from PIF.

Response to Secretariat comments No response needed.

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: Unclear. Considering that the majority of co-financing is listed next to Components 1 and 2 means that replication of investments are expected to happen through the outputs listed in those components; however, none of the outputs relate to the reach the project will have beyond the 40 production units the project will work with directly. Please consider adding relevant outputs regarding the plan for scaling and replicating the direct investments to additional production units with both the FINAGRO and the CAF credit line co-financing.

MGV, November 5, 2019: Outputs have been adjusted to incorporate replication strategy. Comment cleared.

1/4/2021: Gender: The submission states that it will institutionalize gender mainstreaming at all levels of intervention and operation of the project through the development and implementation of a Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan. The project does not provide evidence that any gender analyses /socio-economic assessments have been carried out during the PPG phase to inform the project design or implementation. It also does not elaborate on any gender dimension related to Pana production and or the project components. Please provide additional gender analysis and considerations of

gender dimension/dynamics related to the project components. 3/23/2021: A gender analysis and action plan has been provided. Comment cleared.

1/4/2021: Gender: The submission states that it will institutionalize gender mainstreaming at all levels of intervention and operation of the project through the development and implementation of a Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan. The project does not provide evidence that any gender analyses /socio-economic assessments have been carried out during the PPG phase to inform the project design or implementation. It also does not elaborate on any gender dimension related to Pana production and or the project components. Please provide additional gender analysis and considerations of gender dimension/dynamics related to the project components.

**3/23/2021: A gender analysis and action plan has been provided. Comment cleared.**

#### Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response (29th, May 2019):

Consistent with the objectives of the Fedepanela Strategic Plan for the Pana Sub-sector, and based on estimates of cost for technological transformation, production, equipment and training, a replication factor of 10 has been determined by technical experts of Fedepanela and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, as possible and implementable for each of the 40 units to receive project support. This replication is based on the combined co-financing to be made available by FINAGRO and CAF during project implementation and thereafter.

The actual replication will be achieved through the strategic institutionalization of the technological transformation methodologies, production, and training plans/courses, as a long term campaign by Fedepanela to improve the sustainability of Pana production while increasing to the extent possible, CO<sub>2</sub> mitigation, consistent with the NAMA developed for the Pana sub-sector and with the Fedepanela Strategic Plan. The Technology Transformation Plan and the Support and Monitoring Plan to be developed by the project and adopted by Fedepanela will be instrumental in the replication process.

Outputs have been adjusted to reflect this replication factor in the Project Results Framework of the CAF Project document and in Table B of the CEO Endorsement Request. New text have also been added in both documents to highlight the institutionalization of technological transformations as the primary strategy by

Fedepanela to achieve the estimated replication possible for the co-financing committed for the project.

Agency Response (15th, March 2021):

The Gender Action Plan and Gender Analysis has been attached to the CEO Endorsement Request as Annex G & H.

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: Unclear. While co-financing has increased substantially since PIF, the project has not clearly outlined how exactly it plans to implement a replication strategy to reach beyond the 40 production units and help others access the FINAGRO loans and CAF credit line to carry out similar investments. How does the project aim to support additional panela producers with these two credit-based financial mechanisms? What level of replication will be considered as a successful outcome? How will this be integrated in the project's results framework? Please consider developing and adding a replication and upscaling plan to the project, including relevant outputs and indicators in the results framework. This was a major comment at PIF approval that needs to be addressed for CEO Endorsement.

MGV, November 5, 2019: Replication will be achieved through the institutionalization of the technology transferred through the available sources of financing for panela producers. Comment cleared. However, we note that there is not detailed project budget included in the Project Document, so it is difficult to assess the cost-effectiveness of the project. Please provide a detailed budget.

11/17/2020: Detailed budget has been provided. Comment cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

FINAGRO has multiple mechanisms available to facilitate access to credit by Panela producers. Two key mechanisms are the "Fondo Agropecuario de Garantías" (FAG) and the "A Toda Maquina" credit line, both of which are very familiar to Panela producers. The credit line from CAF will be channeled through the mechanisms of FINAGRO, using the line of credit systems the Panela producers are already familiar with.

The most viable replication strategy is one which is spearheaded by the producer association itself: Fedepanela. As described above, the actual replication will be achieved through the strategic institutionalization of the technological transformation

methodologies and training plans/courses, as a long term campaign by Fedepanela to improve the sustainability of Pana production while increasing to the extent possible, CO2 mitigation, consistent with the NAMA developed for the Pana sub-sector and with the Fedepanela Strategic Plan. This will be coupled with the accessible financing for upscaling by FINAGRO and CAF, which collectively will constitute the overall replication strategy for project results.

The articulation of Outputs and indicators have been adjusted to reflect the anticipated impact of the replication strategy. Estimates of CO2 mitigation already include anticipated indirect mitigation benefits from the replication strategy, as a consequence of the co-financing to be provided by FINAGRO and CAF.

Agency Response (24th Sep 2020):

A detailed budget is included in Annex E.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: Yes.

1/4/2021: Environmental and Social Safeguards: The ProDoc states that the project is classified as Category B (moderate risk). However, the CEO endorsement request states that both environmental and social risks are low. Considering that the project's risk classification in the ProDoc and CEO endorsement is inconsistent, please clarify the risk classification of the project and share, if available, their ESS screening report/documents.

**3/23/2021: Screening report has been provided and it is in line with what is included under risks. Comment cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

No response needed.

Agency Response (15th, March 2021):

The Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Report, in accordance with CAF/GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies has been completed and attached to this CEO Endorsement Request as Annex F . The document is attached in *roadmap-GEF* Portal.

## 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: No, there is a co-financing letter missing, as well as some additional clarifications needed. We were able to confirm the \$200,430 from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, as well as the \$3,167,010 from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the \$9,592,139 from the government.

Please submit the cofinancing letter for CAF's \$200,000 in-kind. Also, please provide a clarification to the letter from FINAGRO to explain how the amount of \$100,520,055 was calculated, including exchange rate utilized and date.

Also, please clarify why the \$2,000,000 funding line created as a financial mechanism for the panela value chain from CAF mentioned is not listed as co-financing.

MGV, November 5, 2019: Not yet.

- Please provide English translations of all the Co-financing Letters (these can be done by the agency). Please add the exchange rate utilized and associated date to the translated letter from FINAGRO as well.

- While we saw the CAF letter for the \$2,000,000, we are still missing confirmation of the \$200,000 in-kind from CAF. Please provide.

11/17/2020:

- Translation for letter that includes co-financing from Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development ? Panela Development Fund, Fedepanela, and Resources from the General Payment System, executed by Fedepanela ( Departments of Cauca, Cudinamarca and Nari?o) has been uploaded. Comment cleared.

- CAF in-kind contribution has been removed. Comment cleared.

- However, no translation was provided for the letter from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Please upload.

- Also, the translated letter from FINAGRO does not yet provide the exchange rate utilized and associated date that shows how the amount in Table C is listed as \$100,520,055. Please explain.

1/4/2021: Co-financing letters and translations have been provided, as well as the exchange rate for the FINAGRO co-financing amount. However, considering that the

letter conforming the US\$ 94M private sector co-financing from FINAGRO is from 2 years ago. Please re-confirm that these estimates provided 2 years ago are still valid and use the current exchange rate.

**3/23/2021: A new co-financing letter from FINAGRO, with a current exchange rate, has been provided and the amount reduced to a total of \$79.8 million (\$23 million + \$3.6 million / year \* 3 years). Comment cleared.**

#### Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response (29th, May 2019):

Co-financing letter for CAF's \$2,000,000 is included in this submission.

The FINAGRO counterpart as appears in the co-financing letter, is divided into two parts: (1) support to sustainable production which included the support provided during the PIF and CEO Endorsement preparation (2015-2017), plus those programmed to be made available during project implementation and after ? 2018-2020 (in the amount of 287,118,929,149 Colombian Pesos); and

(2) programmed support for ?technological transformation? which includes support provided during the PIF and CEO Endorsement preparation (2015-2017), plus those programmed to be made available during project implementation and after ? 2018-2020 (14,441,234,398), for a total of 301,560,163,547 Colombian Pesos.

At the time of the calculation of FINAGRO's co-financing, an exchange rate of 3,000 Colombian Pesos to 1 USD was used, thus producing the USD conversion at \$100,520,054 (rounded to the lower number). The portion of this amount which to be disbursed between 2018-2020 (but which may have to be pushed back due to delays in the start-up of this project), plus the 2 million from CAF can realistically allow for a replication factor of 10, as indicated above, and as determined by experts in Fedepanela, FINAGRO and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. This replication factor is based on figures for credit provided to Panela producers by FINAGRO in 2017-2018

Agency Response (24th Sep 2020):

English translations of Co-financing letters are provided.

The confirmation of the 200.000 in-kind cofinance will not be needed, because of high amount cofinance already provided by the project's partners.

Agency Response (29th nov 2020):

Translations to the letter from Ministry of environment are provided and uploaded. See in Roadmap document in the portal.

The FINAGRO letter has date of 22th November 2018, therefore it was used the official exchange rate of 3.196,26 COP per 1 USD, (see co-financing letter Finagro- <https://www.banrep.gov.co/es/estadisticas/trm>). The calculation resulted USD 94,347,820. An adjustment was made for the differences in the total amount of co-financing. The reviewed cofinance amounts are presented and adjusted budget in PARTS I.A, I.B, I.C and Annex E. Summarized Project Budget.

Agency Response (15th, March 2021):

The co-financing letter has been update by FINAGRO, and the amount has been adjusted e included in the CEO Endorsement Request. The document is attached in *roadmap-GEF* Portal.

#### **6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

##### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: Tracking tools are no longer required. However, we would like additional clarification on how the amount of GHG mitigation was calculated, including a breakdown of direct and indirect emissions benefits (how was the 85 tCO<sub>2</sub>/mill/year calculated? how does it compare to the 521 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/mill/year potential demonstrated by the 2012 study cited? what replication factor is being used to estimate indirect emissions?).

In addition, we noted that in the Core Indicator table it is currently all reported under indicator 6.1 which refers to GHG sequestered or reduced from the land use sector meaning increased carbon in the soil and/or biomass. However, the project's mitigation activities actually fit both in indicators 6.1 (reforestation, reduction of nitrogenous fertilizers) and 6.2 (switching to electric motors, reducing methane emissions from wastewater, alternate uses for waste bagasse).

Further, for Indicator 11 number of direct beneficiaries, please consider also counting the number of people that will be trained, which seems slightly higher based on the results framework in the Project Document.



MGV, November 5, 2019: Comments not cleared.

Thank you for added clarification on how the amount was calculated here and in the Project Document and on the potential for additional benefits in AFOLU as the project progresses. However, we note that amount has to be split in the correct sub-indicators, as it currently lumps the direct and indirect amounts into one. Please separate and update the expected accounting start date. In addition, while the project is in the AFOLU sector, the amounts being mitigated is in the energy sector (as you say, energy efficiency from changes in heat re-circulation and elimination of diesel engines), thus the GHG benefit fits better under Sub Indicator 6.2 not 6.1.

On Indicator 11, thank you for the added clarification on the amount; however we note that the numbers in the Core Indicator table (50 female and 78 male direct beneficiaries) does not match what is reported on the Project Document (64 and 96, respectively). Please fix for consistency across the documents.

11/17/2020: Comment cleared.

#### Response to Secretariat comments

The details of the calculations are part of this submission as an Excel file (GEF EE Tool); the specific reference to 85 tonCO<sub>2</sub>/year is cell U37 in the said Excel File. This calculation refers to savings from changes in heat recirculation and elimination of diesel engines only (?ahorros por recirculador termico y cambio de motores diesel?). It is important to note that the introduction of electric motors instead of diesel, also will result in reduction in emissions from the burning of firewood and rubber tyres. These calculations are also reflected in the GEF EE Tool.

Although the 85 tons are far from the 521 originally proposed, the project proposes other actions that may have associated reductions (AFOLU). However, it is necessary to carry out the relevant actions in order to obtain information that will allow for a precise quantification of the anticipated reductions in emission associated with AFOLU. The baseline information needed for these calculations are not yet available, thus the reason why the Core Indicator was limited to that dealing with savings from changes to heat recirculation and diesel engines only. This is stated in Paragraph 3 on Page 7 of the CAF PRODOC.

Please note that the reductions of GHG emissions associated with the replication mentioned above are already quantified within the Excel file being submitted (GEF EE Tool), under the category of "INDIRECT BOTTOM-UP SAVINGS (2022-2030)". The calculations presented here are far more accurate and reliable than the preliminary estimates presented in the cited 2012 study.

The number of direct beneficiaries has been revised to reflect those to benefit from all trainings, including from the replication process.

**Agency Response (24th Sep 2020):**

It was decided to create a new mitigation calculation tool exclusively for the CPS-NAMA. This new Excel tool was adopted to have a clear understanding of the calculation and to facilitate the tracking of the results.

The considerations for the new tool include: the intervention of 20 mills belonging to group 2 (Small traditional producers) and 20 mills belonging to group 3 (medium producers). These two groups of producers represent 95% of the national production, facilitating the CPS-NAMA to focus its intervention where the greatest mitigation potential of GHG is. For the after-project replication of this activity, it is considered the improvement of 200 mills in group 2 and 200 mills in group 3 between 2023 and 2031.

On the other hand, the reforestation activity for 80 hectares within the intervened areas was included, as part of component 2 of AFOLU. Using the EXACT tool, a total calculation of 29,089 tCO<sub>2</sub>e was obtained for the period 2023 - 2031.

Considering the new options discussed above, the CPS-NAMA project will generate a mitigation potential of 290,184 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e calculated like this: 10.945 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided during implementation of the project for the period 2020-2023) + 66.329 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided during post project for the period 2023-2031) + 212.910 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided for the period 2020-2031). As referenced in PART II: A.1. 5) global environmental benefits of the CEO-Endorsement.

Results are classified into the core Indicator 6: ?Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated? and its corresponding Sub-Indicators 6.2 and 6.1: ?Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU? (for the activities of energy efficiency in mills); and ?Carbon sequestered, or emissions avoided in the sector of agricultural, forestry and other land use? (for the reforestation activity) respectively.

Regarding the Core Indicator 11, it is confirmed that the total number of direct beneficiaries is 160 distributed into 64 women and 96 men. All the documents were revised for consistency with these indicators.

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments N/A

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request MG, February 14, 2019:  
Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments No response needed.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
MG, February 14, 2019: Yes.

MG, November 5, 2019: Please revise the Budgeted M&E Work Plan to ensure that only eligible activities are included. For example, we note that audits should be supported by the PMC and publications and informative materials should be supported by the project budget itself. Further, as Tracking Tools are not necessary anymore, we ask that you change that category to "Monitoring and Evaluation of indicators in project results framework".

11/17/2020: Not cleared. While the costs from financial audits has been removed from Annex 6: budgeted monitoring & evaluation plan, there are still references made to audits in the portal section on the M&E plan and in ANNEX E. SUMMARIZED PROJECT BUDGET in the description of 4.3.1. Please remove. References to tracking tools were also still found.

12/17/2020: Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response (24th Sep 2020):

All suggestions are adopted to update the M&E Budget

Agency Response (29th nov 2020):

All references made to audits have been removed in the corresponding sections of the M&E plan and in Annex E. Summarized Project Budget

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MG, February 14, 2019: Yes.

1/4/2021: Knowledge management is a part of the component 4, outcome 4.2. However, it is not clear a budget for knowledge management activities. Please provide clear budget information for knowledge management activities and outputs.

**3/23/2021: Outcome 4.2 has a budget of \$45,000 from GEF resources. Comment cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

No response needed.

Agency Response (15th, March 2021):

In Annex G "Summarized Project Budget", section knowledge management, the outcome 4.2 has been adjusted. "Production and publication of the guide of Lessons learned, positive impact experiences, and results on a continuous basis during project implementation".

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: GEF Secretariat comments for CEO Endorsement, of which there were two, have not yet been adequately responded to. These comments have been re-stated in comments above.

1) By CEO Endorsement, we expect some articulation of the business model for the energy efficiency investments for the producers and how the replication of these investments will be promoted and incentivized.

2) By CEO Endorsement, we expect a more robust calculation of the GHG emissions reduced by the project as well as an estimate for indirect emissions reduced by replication.

MGV, November 5, 2019: Thank you for the responses to these comments. Please paste these responses in the appropriate section on the Portal submission (Annex B). This is the space for that.

Regarding the comment 2, we note that the indirect estimate should be separate from the direct (during project and post-project), per our comments above, which still needs to be addressed.

11/17/2020: Comment cleared.

### Response to Secretariat comments

A ?GHG Measurement and Reduction Framework? has been developed in late 2017 to determine total NAMA implementation costs, including financial scenarios, preliminary financial model for NAMA implementation, as well as a GHG Baseline Calculation Tool. This framework is currently used to assist the Government of Colombia in the national mobilization of economic resources in support of NAMA implementation at the national level. Consistent with this, recent (2017-2018) direct credit to the Panales sub-sector through financial mechanisms developed by FINAGRO were implemented to facilitate NAMA implementation, with data from 2017 & 2018 providing important contributions to the process of consolidating and validating the true costs associated with implementing the Panales NAMA.

The Fund for Financing of the Agricultural Sector (FINAGRO), has different lines of credit available for the Panales subsector in the form of working capital, investment and portfolio normalization. The investment line is distributed in areas of commercialization, diversification, infrastructure and adaptation of lands, machinery and equipment, support services, plantings and other activities. In 2017 and 2018 credits to the Panales sub-sector were made by FINAGRO in the amount of US\$ 43,212,889 and US\$38,158,397, respectively, demonstrating clear evidence of the confidence the financial sector has in the transformation potential of the Panales sub-sector. Using this credit data from 2017 and 2018, it was determined that an average of US\$102,000 was provided by FINAGRO for each production unit to invest in integral technological transformation of the Panales production process, and thus provided a recent and robust baseline and reference to estimate the true cost of replication and the amount of replication possible with the available co-financing. This text has been added to the ?Replication Section? of both the CAF PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement Request.

Future credit to be provided by FINAGRO and CAF in support of replicating project results will help to further consolidate the comprehensive business model post-project, which was preliminarily developed in late 2017 under the ?GHG Measurement and Reduction Framework?. Project outcomes will be upscaled and replicated with the support of a CAF Credit Line of US\$2,000,000 plus another US\$100,520,054 credit line which has been secured and made available by FINAGRO to the panales sector. These financial mechanisms will complement the institutionalization of technological

transformation, production best practices, training and capacity building by Fedepanela as a consequence of project investments, which collectively constitute the overall strategy for the replicating and upscaling of project results.

In the integral technological transformation of panela production processes in Colombia, 10 productive units are projected as a replication factor for each of the 40 contemplated in the pilot, thus allowing for a total replication of 400 units based on the current investments of the panela producers of the country, and in consideration of the available co-financing from FINAGRO and CAF. The reductions of GHG emissions associated with these replicas are quantified within the GEF EE Tool produced for this project, under the category of "INDIRECT BOTTOM-UP SAVINGS (2022-2030)".

Agency Response (24th Sep 2020):

The responses to GEF comments will be pasted in Annex B.

Regarding comment 2, as explained above: the CPS-NAMA project will generate a mitigation potential of 290,184 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e calculated like this: 10.945 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided during implementation of the project for the period 2020-2023) + 66.329 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided during post project for the period 2023-2031) + 212.910 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided for the period 2020-2031). As referenced in PART II: A.1. 5) global environmental benefits of the CEO-Endorsement.

Data is updated in the project documents.

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

MGV, February 14, 2019: Not yet. Please address comments above. In addition, please fix the Rio Markers selected under Taxonomy. Only 0, 1 or 2 should be selected for each Rio Marker for Mitigation and Rio Marker for Adaptation. In this case, we suggestion Mitigation 2 and Adaptation 0.

Further, we note that reference to a CEO Endorsement Request sections are made and we were not able to find that document uploaded (only the CAF Project Document). For example, the submission seems to be missing section ANNEX C: Status of implementation of project preparation activities and use of funds.

In addition, please select the correctly role civil society will play in the project under the A.3 Stakeholders section in the portal. Also select the result areas the project is expected to contribute to gender equality in the portal section A.4 Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

8/19/2019: Please insert responses to the review sheet into the review sheet on the portal itself so it can be reviewed. Also please check that the CAF's cofinancing letter was submitted, as we took a quick look at the documents uploaded and could not find it.

MGV, November 5, 2019: Thank you for inserting the responses into the review sheet. Please address remaining comments above. We note that the Project Document is missing a detailed project budget. Please provide. In addition, we note that the following comments were not addressed adequately yet:

- The Rio Markers have been selected, thank you - however, we suggested a 2 for Mitigation, and a 1 was selected.

- There is mention under Annex C (see copied text below) that information of PPG activities financing status has been provided in the page 33. However this cannot be found. Please just fill out the table that shows the status of PPG financing per the template.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.**

**A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

Please refer to Ceo Endorsement Request - ANNEX C, page 33.

11/17/2020: Please address remaining minor comments. Please also copy paste the table from the CEO endorsement request on the PPG utilization on the portal section Annex C.

1/4/2020: Most comments have been cleared. Please address remaining comments above. In addition, in Section A.6 of the Portal entry - Please change Executing Partner Type to "Others" as Fedepanela is not a government organization.

3/23/2021: Comments above have been addressed. However, under Executing Partner Type it still lists "Government" instead of "Others". Please change to Others. In addition, please provide a summary assessment of any risks and/or impacts that COVID may have on the implementation of the project as well as any opportunities the project may provide to support the country's green recovery efforts. You may provide this under the RIsks section.

**3/26/2021: Comments above have been addressed. PM recommends CEO endorsement.**

Response to Secretariat comments

The responses have been inserted into the review sheet on the portal. And the cofinance letter has been submitted.

Agency Response (29th nov 2020):

PPG utilization table has been copied and incorporated to Annex C in the portal

Agency Response (15th, March 2021):

The information has been updated in Section A.3, A.4 of the Portal.

The information has been updated in Section A.6 of the Portal.



Agency Response (25th, March 2021):

The information about Executing Partner has been updated to "Others" of the Portal.

In Risk Section A.5 of the Portal has been include about the risks that COVID may have on the implementation of the project.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/14/2019</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/19/2019</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/5/2019</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/17/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/4/2021</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**