



# Restoring Ecological Integrity of Protected Areas of Galapagos, through Strengthening Capacities for Translocations of Birds and Snakes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11346

**Countries**

Ecuador

**Project Name**

Restoring Ecological Integrity of Protected Areas of Galapagos, through Strengthening Capacities for Translocations of Birds and Snakes

**Agencies**

CAF

**Date received by PM**

10/14/2023

**Review completed by PM**

12/1/2023

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Executing Partners in Portal (?Galapagos National Park Service? and ?Fundaci?n de Conservaci?n Jocotoco?) don?t match the executing partner in LoE (?Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition?). You will see that there are other errors in the LOE, so when CAF secures a new LoE, the OFP can also include the executing partner they need to execute this project.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

A new LoE has been prepared and uploaded to the GEF portal

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

12/1/2023

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 or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Project Description Overview**

- 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?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) As will be noted later in this review, the situational context of the proposed set of activities is lacking. The proposed components etc. are well written and sound, however they are not embedded within a larger context and the project description fails to explain how the proposed intervention fits within the existing management plans for the Galapagos National Park. This issue will be elaborated further in the review sheet.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Yes, cleared.

e) On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.1%, for a co-financing of \$12,919,211, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,175,648 instead of \$1,080,789 (which is 8.3%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

### Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

b) A new sub-section has been added to each of the documents covering "Management planning and priority setting". Key documents discussed are: (i) the Galapagos 2030 Strategic Plan, (ii) the Management Plan for the Protected Areas of the Galapagos, and (iii) the Invasive Species Management Plan for the Galapagos. Taken together, these plans, and associated actions particularly as they relate to management of invasive alien species and restoration establish the broad sectoral context and baseline to which the present project is contributing.

e) Co-financing contribution to PMC has been revised to 9.1% to match the proportion of GEF funding dedicated to PMC.

#### 4. Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

**a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**

**b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

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

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a) No. The project intervention and design is very activity driven without a robust problem analysis of the challenges to sustainable management of the Galapagos National Park. Furthermore, the project does not explain how this investment builds on the recently closed project that GEF supported on IAS management in the Galapagos: GEF ID 9282 Safeguarding Biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by Enhancing Biosecurity and

Creating the Enabling Environment for the Restoration of Galapagos Island Ecosystems. GEF has made two major investments in the Galapagos both focusing on IAS control and management. The GEF-8 biodiversity focal area strategy supports systemic approaches to address IAS management and control in island states and archipelagos. Please revise this section of the proposal to explain the current situation of IAS management and control. Are we to conclude that the entire IAS management system in the Galapagos is entirely functional and no other support is required?

b) Yes, cleared.

c) NA.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

## Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

a) New sub-sections have been added to each of the documents covering invasive species eradication and biosecurity, respectively. In addition, the project description has been expanded to discuss translocations within the broader context of invasive species management. This section highlights the fact that restoring the ecological integrity of ecosystems and biodiversity in the Galapagos requires the implementation of multiple activities in tandem such as active restoration through conservation translocations and ongoing IAS biosecurity management and control?the latter to be funded under baseline cofinancing.

### 5 B. Project Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

according to the GEF guidelines?

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a) The project design and theory of change is very focused on one set of activities (species translocation) but it fails to contextualize this intervention within the larger challenge of IAS management and control as well as the management of GNP more generally. As noted previously, this is a very activity driven proposal, with a failure to identify the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss to biodiversity in the Galapagos writ large and what is being done to address these drivers (baseline) and what other activities might be needed to ensure sustainable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (GEF alternative). Please note that GEF's strategy for support to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use promotes an integrated approach that reflects the ambition of the Kunming Montreal Biodiversity Framework. What this project design fails to do is demonstrate how this set of activities is addressing drivers of biodiversity loss overall in the Galapagos. If all of these drivers are being addressed, and translocation is the only activity needed in the Galapagos, then the proposal should clarify that. If the entire IAS management framework for the Galapagos is entirely functional and needs no further support, then the proposal should clarify that as well. Please revise accordingly.

Furthermore, while the project design is solely focused on translocation and offers it up as a scientifically supported solution, the proposal only provides a tentative list dependent on research to be done and "feasibility assessments". This is a risk that is not adequately discussed in the project design.

b) No this is missing, particularly with regards to the recently closed project (9282) on IAS management and control. Please revise accordingly.

c) No, see comment in (a) above.

d) Not completely, see comment in (a) above.

e) and f) cleared.

g) the issue of resilience requires further elaboration. For example, the project doesn't discuss anything about the sustainability of translocations and risk mitigation strategies for this process and in addition, how expected climate change impacts will be considered as part of the translocation plans.

h) i) k) and l) cleared.

j) The project has KM&L activities, and budget. However, there is no clear timeline and communication plans of the project. Please provide a table of knowledge management activities, budget, timeline and communication plan.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

### Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

a) As noted above, the revised proposal has expanded its discussion of IAS as a driver and as a target of control and management, and GNP management as a whole, while placing the project's activities within that overall context.

Regarding the 'tentative' nature of the list of species to be translocated, this is in line with established IUCN Guidelines for Translocations, which require a detailed process of risk identification to be completed prior to final decision being made. Nevertheless, the project team is confident that the species listed are all justifiable / feasible and that, in the unlikely case that one or more species on the list is found to be problematic, alternatives of comparable value will be available.

b) Please see above responses

c) Please see above responses, including expanded rationale

d) Please see response to a) above

g) Climate risks are now discussed in multiple sections, including threats, project rationale, and risks. Potential harmful impacts of climate change will be considered as part of the translocation feasibility assessments and will be mitigated through translocation planning and post-release monitoring. In addition, sustainability will be ensured through post release monitoring and the starting assumption that successful species translocations may require multiple release events in order to ensure a self-sustaining population.

j) A table showing knowledge management activities, budget, timeline and implementation & communications strategy has been added to the CEO ER as Table 7.

#### **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.**

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF**

**financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/23

a) cleared.

b) NA

c) Please note that GEF project 9282 is closed and thus revise text accordingly and delete.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

c) The reference to coordination with GEF project 9282 has been removed.

### **5.3 Core indicators**

**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 targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

a) The METT score for the GNP is already very high. It is not clear from the set of actions being proposed how translocation will have a significant impact on PA management effectiveness as this is simply a set of targeted activities. Normally, GEF projects that seek to improve PA management effectiveness provide a problem analysis of the status quo for the management of the PA, and then propose a comprehensive plan to improve PA management effectiveness. This proposal lacks that comprehensiveness. Please clarify.

With regards to restoration targets, given that the translocations are subject to a feasibility assessment and thus the project is not sure exactly what species will be translocated, how did the project estimate the area that will be restored? Please clarify.

b) Adequate, however, given that the translocations are subject to a feasibility assessment and an analysis of historical literature, the project estimate on GEBs apparently could change. Please clarify.



12/1/2023

Cleared.

## Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

a) The proposal has been revised to more clearly place the issue of conservation translocation within the broader context of management planning and invasive species management. This is intended to demonstrate the timely nature of translocation in the context of protecting and restoring the Galapagos Islands and their globally significant biodiversity. While it is correct that GEF incremental support will not have a large impact on the METT score?given the limited extent to which species restoration is ?counted? by the METT tool?its impact on restoration of several Galapagos Islands should not be underestimated. This impact will only increase over time, based on the emphasis being given to enhancing local capacities for implementing this important conservation tool.

b) As noted in the description of core indicators, the area of land and ecosystems under restoration is expected to be 21,500 ha. This area represents the combined area of Floreana, Santa Fe and Pinzon Islands. Even if changes are made in the selection of species, the project is still expected to undertake restoration on these three islands, where it will be applying ?best practices for ecological restoration? in line with GEF policy.

### 5.4 Risks

**a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?**

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

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

a) Climate risks are not adequately discussed and therefore mitigation measures are not elaborated adequately. The risks analysis talks about short-term weather events as opposed to climate change. Please revise.

b) The risk analysis is adequate, but the assessment that all of these risks are "low" is too optimistic. In order that the project implementation takes these risks seriously, please rate all of these risks as moderate at a minimum.

c) Yes, cleared.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

### Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

a) As noted above, climate risks are now discussed in multiple sections, including threats, project rationale, and risks. Potential harmful impacts of climate change will be considered as part of the translocation feasibility assessments and will be mitigated through translocation planning and post-release monitoring.

b) Risk ratings of all but one of the previously identified risks have been increased (mostly to medium; two from ?negligible? or ?very low? to ?low?) to ensure that they are taken seriously during project implementation.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

No.

The project presentation of alignment with the BD focal area strategy is inadequate. GEF support to improving PA management effectiveness and restoration in biodiversity necessitates nesting the restoration actions within integrated landscape/seascape management approaches that achieves impact at a landscape and seascape scale, which this project does not do. Furthermore, the restoration actions appear to be part of an overall strategy of managing and controlling IAS in the Galapagos however, the project design does not provide this contextual framing either, as was noted above in other parts of this review. Once the project design addresses the issues identified earlier in this review, please refine and revise this section.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

The section on alignment with the BD Focal Area has been revised and expanded.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

The project states that gender considerations have been articulated in section B. While recognizing that most of the relevant islands are uninhabited, the project does not include any analysis/articulation on gender dimensions related to the scope or objective of the project. Please justify the lack of a gender analysis/plan and to consider gender dimensions in component 3 of the project.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

On further review, the project team has added a brief gender action plan (see Section D of CEO doc), in the form of a table linking project outputs to gender-specific actions and considerations.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

The project states that stakeholder considerations have been articulated in section B. While recognizing that most of the relevant islands are uninhabited, the project does not elaborate on any stakeholder consultations carried out in project preparation or provide a stakeholder engagement plan. Please provide additional information on consultations in project development and elaborate further on key stakeholder groups and constituencies, specifically as related to component 3 of the project.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

The proposal has been amended to include a shortened version of the stakeholder participation plan (full version found in the CAF project document). This includes information on consultations in project development and elaborates further on key stakeholder groups and constituencies, including as related to component 3.

## 8 Annexes

### Annex A: Financing Tables

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

(i) Columns "M&E" and "Responsible executing entity" is missed ? please fill out for each budget line accordingly.

(ii) Project Coordinator is charged to PMC and Project components ? being an executing function, it should be entirely charged to PMC. Per guidelines, if there will be specific contribution to project's components, TOR's describing this contribution is needed.

(iii) Vehicles are charged to the budget table. The preference is for vehicles to be charged to co-financing.

12/1/2023

(i) Columns "M&E" and "Responsible executing entity" are still missing ? please fill out for each budget line accordingly as was requested in the first review above.

PM clears the purchase of vehicles.

12/19/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

ii) Technical responsibilities previously assigned to project coordinator role have been separated out as a technical profile / budget line.

iii) A procurement justification form has been added to the CEO document (see Annex J).

Dic 16, 2023

(i) Columns "M&E" and "Responsible executing entity" were included.

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

NA.

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

NA.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

NA.

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

NA.

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?**

**b) 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  
10/18/2023

NA.

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
12/4/2023

Please see the previous comments and recategorize the cofinancing as requested in the first review.

10/18/2023

1) Please include letter of co-financing for CAF as co-financier.

2) Please revise the type of co-financing for all sources of co-financing below from 'grant' to 'in-kind'. Their letters of co-financing support indicate 'in-kind' contribution.

Civil Society Organization	Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	645,000.00
Civil Society Organization	California Academy of Sciences	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	350,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Jocotoco Foundation	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	690,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Galapagos National Park Service	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	11,315,000.00

December 19, 2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

1) A co-financing letter from CAF has been uploaded

2) Reference to the type of cofinancing provided has been updated in line with the letters

Dic 16, 2023

1) A co-financing letter from CAF was already uploaded

2) the type of cofinancing has been updated in co-financing table.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating**



**countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

The template utilized for this project does not specify whether the focal area source is ?BD-STAR Allocation? or ?BD Set-Aside?. The LoE needs to specify the source of funding; BD-STAR allocation. Please submit a new LOE that addresses this issue.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

A new LoE specifying focal area source has been uploaded

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

NA

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (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  
10/18/2023

Yes, cleared for a-d.

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

**8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
10/18/2023

We fail to find any environmental and social safeguards screening or assessment documents and there is no information about environmental social safeguard risks in the section of Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks (page 41) nor Annex F. (Attached document is a general ?environmental and social safeguards for CAF/GEF

projects manual?, and there is NO project specific information.) There are short comments on Climate and Environment and Social risk in page 35 and 36. However, it is not clear how the project assesses against 9 Minimum Standards of GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, and risk management plan. Please provide appropriate environmental and social risk screening documents and environmental and social risk assessment and management plan clearly addressing 9 Minimum Standards of GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards.

12/1/2023

Cleared.

### Agency Response

Nov 28, 2023

We apologize for apparently uploading the incorrect (template) version of the ESS risks document. The completed version should now be appearing. These ESS documents are based on CAF's ESS standards, which have been designed in conformity with the 9 Minimum Standards of GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards.

#### **Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.10 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

10/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

### Agency Response

#### **Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.11 a) 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.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating**

reflows? If not, please provide comments.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

NA

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/18/2023

Please address all issues identified and submit a revised proposal as soon as possible.

12/5/2023

No, please address issues above related to budget presentation and cofinancing categorization which was already identified in the previous review.

12/19/2023

Yes, CEO approval is recommended.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>1SMSP CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/23/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/1/2023</b>	

**1SMSP CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/5/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/19/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	