



Program for improving sustainable marine fisheries opportunities in SADC ? The Case of the Mozambique Channel.

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11452

Countries

Regional (Africa, Comoros, Madagascar, Mozambique)

Project Name

Program for improving sustainable marine fisheries opportunities in SADC ? The Case of the Mozambique Channel.

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

10/19/2023

Review completed by PM

11/15/2023

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments None

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments None

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes; however, during PPG attention needs to be played to expanding plans for using the monitoring data to improve fisheries management plans to consider climate change impacts. This aspect is referenced in Output 1.1.2, but needs elaboration.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No.

1) Component 1 is focused on improving climate warning services, specifically setting indicators and increasing stakeholder involvement. These plans are not sufficiently action-oriented. The GEF is committed to funding measures that will lead to improved fisheries management to reduce climate impacts from extreme weather, flooding, coastal erosion, salinization of water, ocean acidification. Monitoring and raising awareness is not sufficient. This component needs to focus on improving fisheries management by taking measures to actually reduce climate impacts on fisheries, such as establishing regulations, policies, and incentives.

2) The one output that alludes to action is 1.1.4 piloting a network of climate buffers and carbon stocks and PES; however, the description of this output does not explain what is intended by climate buffers, carbon stocks and PES. Instead the description focuses on indicators and vague reference to demonstration sites.

3) Also, the indicators that are noted to be monitored (sea warming, sea level rise, storm frequencies, coral bleaching, and sediment loading) are not specific to fisheries. If the project is going to monitor the impacts to fisheries of climate change, then it needs to monitor how fisheries will be affected by sea warming, sea level rise, etc.

4) Regarding Component 2, output 2.1.1 references "Nature based solutions for mangrove and coral reef management"? Please clarify what NBS are? do you mean restoration of mangroves, establishing new MPAs? How are these NBS related to fisheries? This outputs seems focused on breaking storm surge and sequestering carbon, which are climate benefits not fisheries benefits. While of course co-benefits around climate are important, they are not the focus of the project. Please rethink to ensure the hotspots are related to improving the fisheries.

5) Output 2.1.2 is focused on creating marine fisheries surveillance hubs. The tie to the hotspots (Component 2) is not clear. It would seem surveillance hubs are needed for all fisheries activities, so would not be specific to the hotspot component. It would actually seem relevant to output 3.1.4 Joint Fisheries resources Monitoring Information System established.

6) Output 2.1.3 is focused on promoting integrated livelihoods. It's not clear why this output is tied to the component focused on hot spots. This output is broader, so needs to be moved out to be a new component or perhaps expand Component 3 to be policy harmonization and socioeconomics.

7) The Table on page 39 in the incremental reasoning section for Component 3 discusses "bringing more players into monitoring?". The focus needs to be on taking action, not monitoring.

8) The first sentence under the Project description section notes the importance of inland aquatic food; yet, the project is focused on marine fisheries. Please edit for consistency.

9) Page 18 before 'Overfishing' notes 'TO ADD FIGURE?'. Please delete this note or add a figure.

10) The bulleted text under the GEF Project Proposition section notes the project will include 'nature-based efforts for fisheries related disaster risk management?', which is not mentioned in the project framework description. Please edit for consistency.

11) In the GEF Project Proposition section, the text after the bulleted text notes the entire project will be 'implemented in selected marine hotspots in and around 'MPAs?' but this focus is not discussed elsewhere. In component 2 there is reference to focusing on hotspots, which could logically be MPAs, but not to focusing the entire project on MPAs. The logic is lacking for only focusing on MPAs when the entire fisheries of the MC needs improved management. Please edit for consistency and ensure clear logic.

Agency's Comments

Issue 1)

7 Nov 2023

The component has been re-written and aligned with the ToC. It now has three outputs.

Output 1.1.1 focuses on monitoring and explains the rationale between the selected indicators and their connection with fisheries.

Output 1.1.2 focuses on the development of fisheries CC response guidelines and justifies the connection with the monitoring.

Output 1.1.3 suggests the capacity building and awareness raising needed to ensure that the first two outputs are effective.

Issue 2)

8 Oct. 2023

These terms have been defined and their relevance to the fisheries explained under the second output of Component 1 in the project description, viz:

2.1.2 PES piloted in fisheries management.

Issue 3)

7 Oct. 2023

The rationale for monitoring these and the link with fisheries has been explained in the revised Output 1.1.1. this will be further elaborated at the PPG stage.

Issue 4)

7 Oct 2023

Output 2.1.1 has been revised. The IUCN definition of NbS has been quoted verbatim. It has been clarified that effort will be on restoration of mangroves in critically degraded fisheries hotspots. The multiple co-benefits of mangroves have also been alluded to.

Issue 5)

7 Oct. 2023

We have retained the output under Component 2 and added the below explanation under output 2.1.2 in the main PIF document.

The activities under this output are confined to the fisheries hotspots in order to tie them with the mangrove restoration activities of the above output. Since the introduction of surveillance hubs is new it is best to integrate it with other adaptation actions rather than introduce them in separate locations where the relevance of such hubs might be difficult to illustrate.

Issue 6)

8 Oct. 2023

This has been moved to Component 3 in the main PIF document as the fourth output, viz:

3.1.4 Integrated fisheries livelihoods systems demonstrated.

Issue 7)

9 Oct. 2023

The reasoning has been revised to reflect the objective of the project. It now reads:

The project focuses on measures for the protection rather than the harvesting of marine fisheries. It aims to ensure that marine fisheries are sustainably managed and governed, starting with the involvement of the communities at the local level all the way to the national and regional policy making levels.

Issue 8)

9 Oct. 2023

This has been corrected and the reference to inland fisheries removed. The sentence now reads:

Sustaining both marine wild capture fisheries and aquatic food systems for food, jobs and trade requires multi-level institutional arrangements coordinated across community-based management systems, national fisheries legislatures, and regional governance frameworks.

Issue 9)

14 Oct. 2023

Figure has been added.

Issue 10)

9 Oct. 2023

The reference to disaster risk management has been removed and the bullet point restricted to marine fisheries protection and management, viz:

Promoting the implementation of nature-based solutions in coastal zones for the protection and improved management of marine fisheries.

issue 11)

The introductory section has been replaced by the below text.

The project will be implemented in selected and agreed marine hotspots along the Mozambique Channel coastal zone covering both currently existing marine protected areas (MPAs) and non MPAs areas. No new MPAs will be created. Existing Transfrontier MPAs and similar transboundary areas will get special attention to increase the likelihood of all project activities being joint and therefore foster direct regional cooperation and integration. The selection of MPAs and non MPAs will also allow for comparisons of project impacts in different marine area conservation systems in the long term. Currently, MPAs in the Mozambique Channel cover approximately 16,125 square kilometres. The table below presents the main MPAs found in the Mozambique Channel from which some of the potential project sites will be selected. The exact locations and sites will be identified and agreed with the country stakeholders during the PPG stage of the project. The selection criteria will also be agreed with the stakeholders and the critical sites for each country determined on that basis. It is anticipated, given budgetary constraints, roughly between 80 and 100 square kilometres, of the coastal will be targeted and distributed across the four participating countries using agreed criteria.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(#1 Karrer & #2 Collantes, Oct 25, 2023). No.

1. The discussion of gender-related to fisheries states that women have a minimal role; however, the discussion seems to be focused on roles of boat owners and crew. Often women play a significant role in the processing and sale of the catch as well as governance aspects of the fisheries associations. Please consider these aspects and how the project will empower women further.

2. In addition, please incorporate gender equality considerations in project outputs/activities relating to capacity-building, financing and knowledge management and learning.

Agency's Comments

Issue 1.

10 Nov 2023

The whole discussion has been expanded to touch on the different roles that women, and the youth, play along the whole fish value chain and the challenges they face in executing those roles, the socio-cultural limitations placed on their participation and barriers placed on them regarding leadership roles. The project's intention to deal with these issues is also mentioned.

Issue 2.

14 Nov. 2023

The below statement has been added at the start of the project description in the main PIF document:

In all the project components gender and youth empowerment issues will be mainstreamed with the view to deliberately increase the effective participation of women and the youth in the implementation of activities as well as enhance their leadership roles

in the various institutions established (both new and existing). A more detailed Gender Plan will be developed at the PPG stage.

Additional sentences on women empowerment have been added in the relevant output descriptions.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No.

Regarding stakeholders, the table in the Relevant stakeholders section is heavily focused on government agencies. CSOs and private sector entities are also important and warrant specificity. Please provide a specific list of CSOs and private sector entities that will be engaged by country and regionally. It seems the only CSO consulted during the PIF development was WWF-International and no businesses were consulted. These groups need to be prioritized for consultation during PPG.

Regarding specifically the private sector, the private sector section notes "The project will try its best to engage the Private Sector" and then references the oil and gas, tourism, shipping, fishing and mineral extraction sectors. More specifics need to be provided as to what changes in practices the project will pursue with these sectors. Oil and gas spills are a real threat to fisheries? Will the project try to limit such spills? These plans are not evident in the project. In fact pollution is not mentioned in project plans. Similarly, what are the plans for working with the tourism, shipping, and mineral extraction businesses?

Agency's Comments

Listing CSOs and PS organizations

11 Nov. 2023

Some relevant CSOs have been identified and added to the list. Both regional and country specific non-state actors have been presented.

The regional private sector umbrella body, SADC Business Council, has been presented in the stakeholder list. The project will work with this organization to identify relevant in-country PS players in the fisheries at the PPG stage.

Engagement with private sector

12 Nov. 2023

The section has been expanded to discuss the oil and gas as well as the tourism industries. The perceived impacts of these key sectors and how the project intends to engage with the responsible private sector is highlighted. Basically, the private sector will be engaged in policy formulations as well as requested to contribute to PES initiatives of the project.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No.

The Theory of Change does not have a clear logic and is not consistent with the project description. The Theory of Change needs to convey a logic of how the barriers will be addressed by the inputs, activities, outputs, which will lead to the outcomes. The Theory of Change figure needs to indicate with arrows between the boxes the linkages between the issues, barriers, inputs, etc. Also, in the Theory of Change table, the yellow highlighted boxed texts do not seem to be from the project description. The listed outputs are not comprehensive of the outputs in the project framework although some missing outputs are noted under Key Activities. Some of the bulleted activities, such as Promotion of integrated livelihoods, are not reflective of the project framework. Finally, the three Impacts achieved reflect components 1, 3 and 4, but not 2 (hot spots, protection). And the second impact achieved (Increased resilience to climate induced shocks?) is not focused on fisheries. It is also important that a paragraph or two explaining the logic of the Theory of Change is included.

Agency's Comments

7 Nov. 2023

The initial ToC diagram has been replaced. The new ToC diagram uses color coding to illustrate the different project components and connecting arrows to highlight the intervention logic from baseline issues to anticipated impacts. Each identified baseline issue and barrier is assigned a corresponding outcome. The ToC diagram also presents the project objective and expected long term impact of the project.

An introductory section has been drafted to introduce and explain the revised ToC and the wording of the ToC boxes has been taken directly to the project framework descriptions.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(Salazar, Oct 30, 2023). No. In the Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project section (p73), please respond to the request "please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing."

Agency's Comments

13 Nov. 2023

A whole section to explain how the coordination and cooperation strategy of the project will be implemented has been added to the main PIF document. The strategy considers both past and going initiatives as well as reaches out to institutional memory built in the region over the years implementing fisheries management and governance.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(#1, #2 Karrer, & #3 Parhizkar, Oct 25, 2023). No.

1. While the fisheries target is important, please reexamine what is a realistic target. The target for all of GEF-8 is 2,100,000; therefore, this project estimate of 1,200,000 metric tons (over half the GEF-8 goal) is very high.

2. Please note that the direct beneficiaries need to directly benefit from the project. Usually they are in the 1,000s not 100,000s. Please see guidance on the definition.

3. Please explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators below core indicator table.

Agency's Comments

Issue 1.

12 Nov. 2023

The GEF 8 target of 1,200,00 metric tons has been replaced by a revised estimate of 189,710 metric tons is suggested. The figure is calculated from World Bank estimates for the years 2019, 2020 and 2021 with the assumption only parts of the coastline for each country will be part of the project. The percentage contributions and the reasons for choosing them are given in the main PIF document.

Issue 2.

12 Nov. 2023

The population of direct project beneficiaries has been reduced to 1,560 females and 1,440 males which is 0.03% of the initial figure of 10% which included indirect beneficiaries.

Issue 3.

12 Nov. 2023

The explanations have been provided in the main PIF document.

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(#1 Karrer & #2 Matsumoto, Oct 25, 2023). No.

1. The Risk section notes 'moderate' for environmental and social concerns noting plastic pollution as a particular concern. Clean-ups are noted as a viable solution; however, clean-ups are short-term band-aids that do not reduce plastic pollution, which only returns the next day. The GEF supports circular economy solutions to reduce the production and consumption of plastic in order to minimize waste. The GEF, therefore, funds efforts to reduce the use of plastic (e.g. bags, bottles), switch to reusables (e.g. reusable foodware, bags, bottles).and for the remaining items collect and recycle.

2. The project overall ESS risk is classified as low (D. Policy Requirements, page 82), and AfDB attached the Preliminary safeguard Screening Template. However, it is not clear how to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential socio-economic impacts on the most vulnerable fisheries communities including women and youth due to improvement of fishery management. 1) Please provide a clear plan to consult with them, and further assess and manage these potential social risks in the PPG stage. In addition, the 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation' section (page 77) said Environment and social risk as 'moderate'. 2) Please make them consistent and correct.

Agency's Comments

Issue 1.

13 Nov. 2023

The mitigation approach has been changed completely. It now reads:

MITIGATION: The private sector and local governments will be encouraged to adopt 'circular economy solutions' to reduce the production and consumption of plastic by revising their byelaws and trade practices, e.g., banning of single use plastic bags and bottles as well as increased use of reusables. Recycling initiatives targeting SMEs and community youth will also be encouraged. In addition, awareness raising on plastics and effluent will be embed in wider climate shock and resilience campaigns of the project at the local community level. The PS will be encouraged to support such initiatives as part of their CSR activities.

Issue 2.

13 Nov. 2023

The overall risk rating has been set as 'moderate'. The below sentence has been added to clarify that the final risk rating will be determined at the PPG stage:

The safeguards risk rating is considered 'moderate'. However, a detailed assessment of the actual risks and required safeguards shall be determined at the PPG stage when the exact hot spots and other project areas are fully determined. The locations of these sites, and subsequent consultations with the affected people, will clarify which communities will be affected, what vulnerabilities they face, what compensatory measures need to be considered and whether total or partial relocations will be required.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

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's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

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's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No.

Given the anticipated biodiversity benefits to MPAs, please add an explanation as to how this project will contribute to the GBF targets.

Agency's Comments

12 Nov. 2023

GBF targets 8,1,2 and 11 have been identified as key GBF targets addressed by the project and a brief explanation of their alignment with the project provided in the main PIF document. These targets are also presented in full for clarity. Secondary targets 19c, 19d and 23 are also mentioned and the rationale for highlighting them given.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments None

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No. The list of stakeholders consulted is provided, but not the dates.

Agency's Comments

13 Nov. 2023

A brief explanation of the consultation process is provided and the list of stakeholders who participated at various stages during the project formulation period is provided together with the dates of the key meetings/workshops that were held.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments None

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). Yes

(Salazar, Oct 30, 2023). No. GEF Financing and PPG Tables require to amend the option selected in column 'Country/Regional/Global': instead of 'Africa', it must be 'Regional'.

Agency's Comments

14 Nov. 2023

This has been changed accordingly.

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

(12/01/2023) Tanzania was removed from the project and the integrity of the project remains valid. Nevertheless, it is expected that Tanzania will send an LOE in the next week(s) and join during PPG.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No. The LOE for Tanzania is missing. Please add or remove Tanzania from the project. Also, the GEF Financing Table needs to indicate "Africa". Please edit.

Agency's Comments

30 November 2023

Tanzania has been removed from the project and the PIF document revised accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

(12/01/2023) Tanzania was removed from the project and the integrity of the project remains valid .Nevertheless, it is expected that Tanzania will send an LOE in the next week(s) and join during PPG.

(Karrer, Nov 14, 2023). No. The Tanzania LOE is missing.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No. Madagascar and Mozambique LOEs are provided. The Comoros and Tanzania LOE need to be provided in order to be considered.

Agency's Comments

14 Nov 2023

The LOEs for Madagascar, Mozambique and The Comoros were provided. The LOE for Tanzania is being prepared and will be submitted as soon as it is available.

30 November 2023

Despite constant and repeated communication on the matter, and promises by country officials to submit, the LOE it did not arrive in time for final submission, and we had no option but to remove the country from the project.

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

Secretariat's Comments

(12/1/2023) Revised LOEs for Comoros, Madagascar, and Mozambique have been provided which now include the said footnote.

Cleared.

(Salazar, Oct 30, 2023). No. The template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: *?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?.* Per the attached email back in March when we were aiming to constitute June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs *?with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?.* While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

Agency's Comments

14 Nov 2023

The LOEs were resubmitted with the relevant footnote.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

(12/01/2023) Yes. The project is technically cleared and recommended for a future work program.

Tanzania was removed from the project and the integrity of the project remains valid .Nevertheless, it is expected that Tanzania will send an LOE in the next week(s) and join during PPG.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2023). No.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/25/2023	11/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/14/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/1/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		