

Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10165

Countries

Togo

Project Name

Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/8/2020

Review completed by PM

5/5/2021

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Some clarifications requested. Some of the outputs are written as outcomes. For example, output 3.1.2 is written as a longwinded outcome. Please simplify. Same comment for 3.1.3, and 1.2.3.

Also, please clarify the meaning of this output: "**2.2.2** Vulnerable groups (youth, women) living in targeted fragile ecosystems are accompanied in activities (e.g. ecotourism) that contribute to climate change resilience." What does accompany mean in this context?

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - 3.1.1 is still not an output. While it was not mentioned in the original comment, the comment was meant to apply to all outputs -- they should be written as easily measurable against the development/project objective and outcomes.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Cleared thank you.

Agency Response

Addressed. Outputs have been simplified.

18/3/2021 - Output 3.1.1 has been simplified further as suggested.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/15/2020 - Clarifications requested: 1) PALCC is listed as providing co-financing but it is ending in 2022, whereas the proposed initiative's implementation period is 5 years. Please clarify as it does not seem as the timelines are comparable. 2) EU is listed as GEF Agency, whereas IFAD is listed as a donor agency please correct.

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

1) PALCC is supposed to end in Dec. 2022 therefore with an overlap in project duration of about two years. Due to implementation delays caused by COVID 19, the project will most likely be extended for an additional year, therefore overlapping potentially for three years. The EU has also announced its interest in funding a project Phase II for a total of \$5M covering 2023-2027, mainly focusing on buffer zones restoration activities. At project inception, the co-financing table will be reviewed to reflect these changes once the above has been confirmed.

2) Addressed. Correct info is now reflected in the Portal and Prodoc.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/16/2020 -
Yes.

Agency Response

In response to points 1) and 2) below in the Recommendations section:

1) A justification for the purchase of 1 vehicle was added within the project excel budget as well as in Prodoc Annex A2 as follows:

Justification for budgeting 1 vehicle:

In consideration of Project and Program Cycle Policy GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, GEF funds will cater for the purchase of at least one vehicle, deemed essential to deliver field activities. The project heavily depends on transportation capacity to carry out the planned ground work both in terms of implementation, and monitoring of activities. Access to transportation is required on a regular basis to achieve desired outcomes within the project timeframe. Bad road conditions, frequent rains and rough off-road tracks, make other kinds of transportation an unsuitable option and a danger. Car availability is limited and resources to invest in new cars are scarce in ODEF and AVSF. FAO does not have sufficient vehicles, therefore cannot make this available in the form of co-financing. The choice of renting cars instead of buying new ones was considered, but not found appropriate as it is more costly than the purchase of a vehicle. For the reasons mentioned above and as a result of several field missions in Togo and extensive discussions with ODEF and partners, the project formulation task force deems necessary the purchase of at least one vehicle by the project. We hope you can reconsider, in the understanding that only basic field pickups are being requested. The budget will be revised accordingly

2) The PMC related activities that the Project Officer will be responsible for were added in Prodoc section 6.a Institutional arrangements for project implementation (and relevant Portal section).

2/25/2021 - In response to the comments raised by PO on vehicles. Please see revised justification as follows (reflected also in resubmitted Prodoc) before the link to Annex A.

In consideration of Project and Program Cycle Policy GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, GEF funds will cater for the purchase of at least one vehicle, deemed essential to deliver field activities. The project heavily depends on transportation capacity to carry out the planned ground work both in terms of implementation, and monitoring of activities. Access to transportation is required on a regular basis to achieve desired outcomes within the project timeframe. Bad road conditions, frequent rains and rough off-road tracks, make other kinds of transportation an unsuitable option and a danger. Car availability is limited and resources to invest in new cars are scarce in both ODEF and AVSF (main executing partners). Moreover neither ODEF nor FAO has any vehicle from past GEF projects. This is the first GEF project in the Country with FAO as GEF Implementing Agency. FAO does not have sufficient vehicles, therefore cannot make this available in the form of co-financing. The choice of renting cars instead of buying new ones was considered, but not found appropriate as it is more costly than the

purchase of a vehicle. The cost for renting is 110 USD per day. If we consider having 7 days/month of field trip, during the 5 years of implementation the car renting will cost (420 days X 110) USD 46,200 (at least ? as this would include only field missions) - rental prospectus was uploaded in the Portal. For the reasons mentioned above and as a result of several field missions in Togo and extensive discussions with ODEF and partners, the project formulation task force deems necessary the purchase of at least one vehicle by the project (basic field pickup). The vehicle will be bought at the condition that after project closure, it will be given to the OFP office and put at the service of other GEF projects in the country.

Responses to PPO comments raised in GEFSEC DECISION RECOMENDATION dated 3/1/2021 and 4/2/2021 are provided in GEF Secretariat comments below and are available in RoadMap.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/16/2020 - Yes. This is cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/16/2020 - Clarification sought - if the total targeted intervention area contains 42% of the total population, why is the number of direct beneficiaries so low?

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021- This is cleared, thank you for the additional information.

Agency Response

Relevant text was revised clarifying that the wider/broader landscape (the entire coastal area of Togo) contains 42% of the total population rather than the targeted intervention area itself. However, an additional target was included under outcome 3.1 quantifying the number of beneficiaries benefitting from value chain support activities (about 100,000 people in total). The CCA TT was revised accordingly.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/17/2020 - More information requested. The main causes resulting in the listed barriers are described, but not specifically how the project activities will address each of them, particularly barrier 5?

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - This additional information is much appreciated. This item is cleared.

Agency Response

The project theory of change has been updated to better reflect the alignment between project activities and identified barriers. Same goes for the corresponding narrative in section 2. ?Proposed alternative scenario? (p.49-50). Barrier 5 was reformulated to make the link more explicit.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes. This is clear in the proposal.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - More information requested on the baseline activities in this section would be appreciated and help provide a full picture of the LDCF financed activities.

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response Additional text was introduced in Prodoc section 1.a.2) ? under the narrative describing each of the project outcomes as well as in the ToC description.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Clarification requested. Table 5 in Section 4 indicates that the proposed intervention will provide trainings on CCA which are additional to the complementary activities being financed by ProMIFA and the "ProMIFA staff and stakeholders will be associated to the vulnerability assessments under output 1.1.1." Please clarify the meaning of this? More information on how the specific LDCF activities are additional to those being financed by ProMIFA would be appreciated in this table

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021- This is cleared.

Agency Response More explicative text was added to table 5.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - More information requested. There is some general information here, but more specific information regarding how the proposed activities will directly result in increased resilience of the target communities - particularly in paragraphs 3 and 4.

GEFSEC, 2/16/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was added in Prodoc section 1.a. 5 GEB section.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes. This is well articulated in the proposal.

Agency Response
Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/16/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - More clarifications requested.

- Please list what the opportunities presented by the project activities are to address the context specific issues raised in the gender analysis?
- The gaps/opportunities section references a study - is this study being conducted as part of the project? Otherwise, why is this mentioned here - as a gap that the project activities will address?
- Why are the targets in the Gender Action Plan empty and listed as "to be determined during the inception phase"? At this stage of the project development, we are expecting more clarity on this.

GEFSEC - 2/16/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

- The opportunities vis a vis gender issues and the gender baseline scenario are listed in the GAP document.
- Gender specific studies will be conducted as part of the project as an activity under outputs 2.2.1; 3.1.1; 3.1.2;3.1.3; 3.1.4.
- After a further analysis, targets in the GAP have been updated.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes. The risk matrix is adequately developed for this stage of project development.

Agency Response FAO, 2/25/2021 - Additional text was included under the Risk session addressing the recommendation below re opportunities for contributions towards COVID 19 response, short term and long term opportunities for green recovery.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Clarifications requested:

- "With FAO providing oversight as GEF Agency as described below" - does this indicate that FAO will be undertaking any executing functions?

- Is there any coordination with ongoing or GCF pipeline projects (aside from the NAP Readiness activities, which are well noted)?

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

- No, as GEF Agency FAO will be responsible for providing project cycle management and support services as established in the GEF Policy. The sentence was eliminated from the Prodoc to avoid any misunderstanding.

- As outlined in the implementation arrangements the GCF team in Togo will be part of the Technical Consultative Committee, at project inception the project will further liaise with the team to understand the progress of relevant GCF projects.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes this project is well aligned with Togo's NAP process as well as Togo's NAPA priorities.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - More information requested. There is good information regarding the knowledge aspect of the project components. However, the KM approach is referring to how the project will capture and disseminate knowledge about the project itself's activities and achievements. More information to the last paragraph would be appreciated -- how this project will go about generating, managing, and disseminating the information produced and shared by the project activities to capture and disseminate results and maximize potential for impact.

GEFSEC, 2/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

Agency Response Additional information re the KM approach was added in Prodoc Section 8 on Knowledge Management.
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - No. There does not seem to be an ESS Screening on the portal for this project. Please provide.

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - Yes. This is provided.

Agency Response Addressed. The ESS screening checklist has been uploaded in the Portal.

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - More information requested. Are there any quantifiable impacts expected from the income generating and livelihood diversification activities? How much can incomes expected to be supplemented from these activities and how does this affect economic resilience in the target areas?

GEFSEC, 2/3/2021 - This needs to be reflected in the Portal as well.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared, thank you.

Agency Response

Additional text was added in the GEB section of the Prodoc (section 1.a.5).

2/18/2021: Text added in Portal section 10. Benefits.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -

Yes, this is included in Annex A of the Prodoc.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -
See below.

Agency Response

3/26/2021

In response to the additional items to be addressed below:

1. This is an LDCF project, FA Outcomes are not applicable.
2. Unofficial translation uploaded in Portal. Co-financing from IFAD amended in Portal and Prodoc. EU letter now specifies kind of cofinancing.
3. Done.
4. Done.
- 5.

- Budget amended in M&E Plan

- The budget was revised to have the Project Coordinator partly under PMC. After discussion with the national counterpart, the Project Implementation Support Officer (who would have been hired by AVSF in support to daily coordination and project implementation - in view of the heavy workplan and broad spectrum of activities AVSF will need to execute in harmonization with the rest of the project executed by ODEF and other partners- was eliminated.

- The Administrative/Finance Officer will be part of the PMU and will be recruited by ODEF, the Procurement Officer will be part of the PMU and will be recruited by ODEF, the Finance/accountant Officer will be recruited by AVSF and will not be part of the PMU ? these figures are now fully covered by PMC. The CTA is a technical profile, he/she shall NOT be covered by PMC. TORs of PMU members are available in Annex M. As requested by Government, none of these key figures shall be covered by cofinancing sources, there is no possibility of having current staff appointed full time to the project. The PMC portion of cofinancing will cover for: PSC staff time participating to annual (and interannual if needed) meetings, staff time participating to the Technical Consultative Committee, ProMIFA?s and PALCC management staff participation to coordination meetings, OFP?s monitoring missions, provision of office space (including maintenance) for PMU staff and other staff contributing to the project, the cost of a full time driver, vehicle maintenance, meeting facilities, utilities (internet, water and electricity), provision of office supplies including stationary and printing, etc.

- Financial spot checks and Annual Audits of Executing Partners shall be covered by PMC. These are conducted by an external audit to avoid conflict of interest. If

requested, FAO can provide the service costs of the audit firm who will conduct the financial spot checks and annual audits. The number of spot checks and audits to be carried out throughout project implementation depends on risk levels identified in fiduciary assessments performed for each of the Executing Partners during PPG. These assessments are available upon request.

The executing agencies proposed by the Ministry of Environment are ODEF and AVSF. While AVSF guarantees most (but not all) the set of compliance with UN and GEF fiduciary standards required to execute, ODEF needs PMC and Risk Mitigation Monitoring support of its execution capacities and therefore will be subject to semestral financial spotchecks and audits.

4/6/2021

In response to the additional items in the recommendation section below :

1. Done

3. Katya to verify if IT bug is preventing you from seeing the summary budget in Portal Annex E. The full budget spreadsheet is available in RoadMap

5.

- AFO and PO are fully under PMC while the CTA is under technical components as he/she is not intended to provide PMC eligible functions. adjusted TORs of PMU members are provided in RoadMap and in Prodoc Annex M. Co-financing is not sufficient to cater for operations staff, as explained. PMC is within the 5% threshold.

- In addition to the answer provided above, the revised budget details unit costs for each spot-check. Spot-checks are part of the audit functions. Spot-checks assess samples of transactions while the annual audit is more encompassing, looking also at the wider progress with risk mitigation measures agreed with the EA during formulation and based on the fiduciary assessments of the partner. According to FAO policy, executing agencies are subject to 1 or 2 spot-checks per year, depending on their risk level. Audit and spot-checks are not only financial assurance activities but are also a key vehicle for building the execution capacity of partners and foster fiduciary trust.

- driver and miscellaneous have been removed from the budget.

Responses to these comments are also available in RoadMap, word document entitled "Comments GEF PPO Togo_4.2.2021"

4/28/2021

-Comment 3: Addressed.

-Comment 5: Addressed. Budget lines were re-discussed with national counterpart. The salary of the project coordinator is now spread between PMC, technical components, M&E reflecting TORs content. The item "computer, equipment and consumables (AVSF/ODEF) is was reduced and is now under PMC. Office expenses was eliminated.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -
Yes, responses to comments from Germany and the United States are in Annex B of the Prodoc.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -
Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -
This is cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 -
Cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

?GEFSEC, 12/21/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit.

Please also refer to the following comments:

1) Please remove all vehicle and affiliated costs from the GEF budget - this is not an eligible expense for GEF funding and the Secretariat strongly prefers this cost to be covered by co-financing.

2) Please indicate the Project Officer function which is being billed to PMC?

3) In line with steps taken to ensure continuity of business during the COVID-19 pandemic, please provide some additional analysis on Risks and Opportunities presented by the pandemic within the specific context of this project.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Further information requested on item 3 - the billed cost for 1 4X4 is 40,000. Please indicate the cost of renting a car for the days needed for this project. Additionally, is there any specific reason why this cost cannot be covered by the baseline financing? Lastly, what will be done with the vehicle after project closure? Please clarify if this is the only LDCF project which will be under implementation in Togo by FAO? There seem to be other projects under implementation by FAO with funding from other GEF sources -- meaning, a vehicle may already exist for these purposes? Thank you in advance for any clarification.

Additionally, the extra section of risks and mitigation measures posed by the COVID-19 pandemic is appreciated, please provide some brief text on the opportunities for this project to address both short term needs such as risk mitigation or longer-term actions such as ?green recovery? and resilience building strategies and actions. This includes green recovery strategies and actions include investments in sustainable, inclusive, resilient, low-carbon, low-polluting, nature positive and circular economy-based pathway for society to withstand future shocks coming from climate change, natural and manmade disasters, and other global challenges. Climate change adaptation projects have the potential to support resilient livelihoods and infrastructure to support green recovery and future resilience, and this project is well poised to do so.

GEFSEC, 3/1/2021 - Yes. The Agency has adequately responded to all flagged items and this project is being recommended for technical clearance. Please note that PM is recommended an exception for vehicle purchase, which is documented in the review sheet -- the agency has provided justifications for this, including that this is the first LDCF project being implemented by FAO in the country and that the cost of renting a vehicle is higher than purchasing one.

Additional items to be addressed:

1. Missing Focal Area Outcomes ? please amend.
2. Co-financing: Both letters are only in French, please include translations (unofficial is OK). Also, the letter from the European Union does not specify the type of co-financing. Co-financing from IFAD should be reported as co-financing from ?donor Agency? since IFAD is not the GEF Agency for this project.
3. Project Results Framework, Responses to Project Reviews, Status of Utilization of PPG, Map and Budget Table should be included in Portal
4. There is an overlap between a figure and the text included in section 6 (Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects) of the Portal which doesn't allow to properly read this section ? please amend.
5. Budget:
- M&E in ProDoc amounts \$170,000 while in M&E Plan amounts \$137,00.

Please ask the Agency to amend.

- Project Coordinator's salary (\$150,000) is charged to the components while a Project Implementation Support Officer's salary (\$135,000) is charged to the PMC. When reviewing the TOR's (see below), it is not possible to understand the added value of the Project Implementation Support Officer As basically all hers/his functions would be to "support" the Project Coordinator in hers/his duties and responsibilities. This is the first time the Secretariat has observed that a Project Coordinator requires an assistant that basically will support the PC's work. This is not the most cost effective use of GEF resources. Should this Project Implementation Support Officer really needed, it should be charged to the co-financing resources (the full co-financing amount is represented in Grants, and the portion allocated to PMC is \$2,000,000 ? hence, this salaries can be covered by the co-financing amount of the PMC).

- A Chief Technical Advisor's salary (\$216,000) and the Administrative Financial Officer's salary (\$102,000), the salary of the Procurement Officer, and part of the Salary of the Financial Officer (\$13,880) are charged to the project's components with no Terms of Reference. As the above mentioned positions are part of the Project Management Unit, these salaries have to be charged to the PMC ? the full co-financing amount is represented in Grants, and the portion allocated to PMC is \$2,000,000 ? hence, these salaries can be covered by the co-financing amount of the PMC ? please amend

- Spot checks for the value of \$42,750 are charged to PMC ? there is no explanation at all of what this means, so it is not possible to understand why this is charged to PMC ? please explain and amend if needed.

- While the exception for the vehicle is still being considered, the driver's salary (\$36,000) is strongly preferred to be charged to the co-financing portion of PMC (the full co-financing amount is represented in Grants, and the portion allocated to PMC is \$2,000,000 ? hence, these can be covered by the co-financing amount of the PMC). Please amend this.

- Miscellaneous (\$40,000) is charged to PMC ? GEF funds do not cover miscellaneous expenses. Please amend.

GEFSEC, 4/2/2021

Thank you for the responses, however a few remaining items must be clarified:

- 1) ?1) Please choose the FA Outcomes for CCA ? they should be there in the drop down menu.
- 2) ?2) OK
- 3) 3) PPG: OK; Reviews: OK; MAP: OK; Budget table does not show up
- 4) 4) OK
- 5) 5) - Again, Budget table does not show up so cannot confirm if this has been fixed;

- Project Implementation Support Office eliminated: OK;

- Please clarify what exactly has been amended in reference to the comment on the CTA, AFO, and the PO? These are not suggestions ? they come directly in line with GEF Policy.

- Spot checks: Please provide the service costs and any other relevant information.
 - Please respond regarding the driver?s salary of 36k
 - Please respond regarding the Miscellaneous costs of 40k

GEFSEC, 4/18/2021 - Responses in yellow highlight in the Agency Response box to "Comments at CEO Endorsement" are OK for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - PIF to be returned to the Agency as some comments provided on March 11

Comment 3:

Partially addressed: Budget table is not complete. As per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?..? What is presented in Portal is a summary of the Budget, not the complete budget. The full budget as in ProDoc is required (perhaps consider presenting the budget per component instead of per output/outcome). Only when the full budget is presented, can a final assessment be provided.

Comment 5 on Budget: though the complete budget is needed in Portal for final assessment, still there are two comments to address:

- ? Project Coordinator?s salary is heavily charged (91%) to the project?s components. However, the TOR?s still show (as it must be ? otherwise this position couldn?t be named ?Project Coordinator?) that most of his/her tasks/responsibilities are associated to properly coordinate the project. For this reason, the proportion of salary that needs to be covered by PMC needs to be commensurate with the tasks associated with the position and the TORs
- ? While this was not mentioned in the previous revision as they were not in the previous version, we have noticed that office supplies and equipment are charged to the project?s components ? these items are associated with the execution of the project, reason why they have to be covered by the PMC. Specifically there are two budget items:
 - Computer, equipment and consumables (AVSF & ODEF) - \$34,500

- Office expenses (electricity, water, phone, fuel etc.) (ODEF AVSF) - \$67,467

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Budget has been uploaded, and budget related comments above have been removed. These items are cleared.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/21/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Please see "Comments"