

Integrated Landscape Management of Heart of Borneo Landscapes in Sabah and Sarawak

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10237

Countries

Malaysia

Project Name

Integrated Landscape Management of Heart of Borneo Landscapes in Sabah and Sarawak

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/6/2023

Review completed by PM

5/5/2023

Program Manager

Peter Umunay

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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
4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

Yes ? the project remains aligned with BD, CCM and LD focal areas elements.

Q1. Could you please change the duration of the project to 72 months?

Agency Response
UNDP, Response, 17April 2023

The duration of the project is 72 months (01 Oct 2023 to 30 Sep 2029). The following explanation has been added to the CEO ER:

The project duration is proposed to be six years (72 months), compared to 60 months at the project concept stage. Considering the proposed transformational impacts, a duration of 72 months was considered more appropriate for achieving the envisaged change.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Yes ? the submission has addressed comments from the upstream review. Indicators and targets are included and aligned with specific outputs and clearly stated in Table B with additional information provided in the Project Document

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

5/5/2023

Cleared - "Reference of non-confirmed co-financing from Unilever removed from Project Document and annexes. This co-financing will be reported at MTR, if materialized during project implementation".

4/27/2023 PU

The 2.5M co-financing from Unilever was committed for the period 2019 ? 2023 ? the Agency was requested to confirm if this co-financing can still materialize throughout the duration of the project. In the Review Sheet the Agency responded ?The PPG team has requested Unilever?s confirmation that their co-financing will further materialize during the project implementation phase. Confirmation will be forwarded to the GEF SEC upon receipt.?

Therefore, in absence of confirmation, can you remove this non-confirmed co-financing, If later on it is materialized, they can report it at MTR.

4/25/2023 PU

All sources of co-financing have been documented and attached in the annex. Overall co-financing is good but private sector co-financing remains quite limited when compared to other sources.

Q2. Are there opportunities to explore other sources during project implementation given the number of private companies operating in the region as shown in project document's tables 3&4 (pp 13-14)?

Q3. The 2.5M co-financing from Unilever was committed for the period 2019 ? 2023. As we are now at the end of this period, can you confirm if this co-financing can still materialize throughout the duration of the project?

Agency Response

UNDP, response, 5 May 2023

Reference of non-confirmed co-financing from Unilever removed from Project Document and annexes. This co-financing will be reported at MTR, if materialized during project implementation.

UNDP, Response, 17April 2023

Q2. The co-financing section in the CEO ER has been amended by confirming that there will be opportunities to explore other sources of co-financing during project implementation. During the PPG phase, the following 15 private sector companies were cleared through UNDP's due diligence process; this helps facilitate direct engagement with some of the key private sector enterprises in the palm oil value chain.

- ? Austindo Nusantara Jaya
- ? Barry Callebaut
- ? Cargill
- ? Danone SA
- ? Golden Agri-Resources
- ? Hargy Oil Palms Ltd.
- ? IKEA
- ? Mars Inc.
- ? Mondelez
- ? Neste Oyi
- ? Olam
- ? PepsiCo
- ? Sime Darby Plantations
- ? Starbucks
- ? Unilever

Q3. The Unilever investments that were mobilized during the PPG phase provided important contributions to the strengthening of the Sabah Jurisdictional Approach Initiative. The PPG team has requested Unilever's confirmation that their co-financing will further materialize during the project implementation phase. Confirmation will be forwarded to the GEF SEC upon receipt.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

YES ? the storyline has been tightened and all project components are jointly contributing to the overall project objectives of improved management of the landscape, promote sustainable and resilient palm oil value chains, and invest in participatory conservation and restoration.

Q4. On the budget: A Chief Technical Advisor has been charged across the components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Could you please review this? When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines)

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17April 2023

Q4. The Implementing Partner (Executing Agency) is covering the full cost of the Project Manager position through the recipient country co-financing contributions. This is a substantial contribution to the overall project management costs. The terms of reference of the Chief Technical Advisor have been updated, more clearly reflecting the technical assistance role of this position.

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 YES ? the agency reports a remaining balance of \$15,182.25 already committed.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

Overall, the core indicator targets remain realistic considering that Sarawak region was dropped to keep Sabah.

No changes made for the core indicator 3 which proposes to support the restoration of 200,000 ha of which 50,000 ha on cropland and 150,000 ha on forest.

Core indicator 4 ? was reduced from 2.8M ha to 2,380,763 ha with Sarawak deciding not to participate in the project. The values are cumulative of Sub indicator 4.1 (2,366,763 ha through ILM into three key intervention areas) and sub indicator 4.4 (14,000 ha of HCVF loss avoided). Since we suggested this indicator to be 1.6M, we wonder if there was any consideration to increase the targeted ha given the exclusion of Sarawak region.

Core Indicator 6 ? we suggested the Agency to add to the package the entire Ex-ACT tool file which (Annex 17) gives a better understanding of the assumptions made. The proposes end target is now 10,740,674 tCO₂e (from 3M tCO₂) which is realistic as cumulative CO₂e reductions and sequestration over the 20-year period for the lifetime of investments.

Core indicator 11 ? was reduced from 96,426 to 54,000 of which 27,000 women beneficiaries as Sarawak decided not to participate in the project.

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

Core Indicator 4. The project landscape was delineated through extensive discussions with the Sabah Forestry Department (Implementing Partner). The delineated landscape covers a large proportion of the land area of the state and includes critical ecosystems that are under pressure of existing and planned development. The 14,000-ha target of HCVF loss avoided was also formulated through discussions with project stakeholders and represents a reasonable objective for the project to achieve, in addition to facilitating improved practices across more than 2.3 million ha. If additional HCVF loss avoided is achieved during project implementation, then these achievements along with the associated mitigation benefits will be reported in project progress reports.

Core Indicator 5. The entire Ex-ACT file was submitted as part of Annex 17 (Estimation of GEF 7 core indicator end targets) to the Project Document. The file is also being included with the resubmission for ease of reference.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

The descriptions of the threats, root causes and barriers towards achieving the long-term vision are sound. However, still we are unclear how the project will address each of these barriers. The incremental reasoning needs to be better fleshed out and reflect responses to these.

We still believe that additional information should be included on the context related to the challenges with the food systems as whole beyond the landscape level. The challenges related to sustainable value chains and sustainable food systems at the national level and then how this feeds into the sub-national and site level. We do notice that the application of agroecological diversified farming and livelihood systems in the ProDoc.

Two questions:

Q6. How the project will work collectively with actors involved (PS, GVT, and cooperatives to address these challenges) ? what will be the role of each actor?

Q7. How are the financing institutions currently involved? What role do they play in terms provisions for sustainable financing?

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

The following narrative has been added to Section II (Development Challenge) of the Project Document, under the sub-section "Context". The same entry has been added to the CEO ER under the Global environmental problems, root causes, and barriers that need to be addressed (system description)? section:

"Malaysia's food system is shaped by agriculture and commodity production. At the national level, agriculture contributed 7.1% of the Gross Domestic Product (at 2015 constant prices, Department of Statistics) while in Sabah it contributed 15.9% in 2021. Both are intricately linked through land use systems and rural livelihood generation. Malaysia ranked 41 on the Global Food Security Index (GFSI) out of 113 countries with an overall score of 69.9 (<https://impact.economist.com/sustainability/project/food-security-index/explore-countries/malaysia>). From the four attributes that contribute to the overall score, Malaysia performed highest in terms of affordability (score of 87), quality and safety (74.7), availability (59.5) followed by the lowest scoring in terms of sustainability and adaptation (53.7). Key challenges facing the sector are linked to increasing production costs and declining yields, climate risks and infectious diseases, shortages of labour because of rural to urban migration and high dependence on foreign labour (Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industries. 2021. National Pathway for Food Systems Transformation. Presented at the United Nations Food Systems Pre-Summit (UNFSS), 26 - 28 July 2021 and Ministry of Plantation Industries and Commodities. 2021. National Agricommodity Policy 2021-2030).? This project provides the platform to strengthen the enabling framework to address the key challenges faced by the sector as well as elevating the capacity of the project stakeholders to address the gap related to Malaysia's scoring on the Global Food Security Index in terms of sustainability and adaptation.

Q6. The following narrative has been added to Section III (Strategy) of the Project Document, under the Summary of project approaches (Systems leadership) sub-section. The same narrative was added to the CEO ER in the Project Justification Section, under the Summary of project approaches (Systems leadership) sub-section.

The project initiatives on Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) and systems leadership training provide the platforms and mechanisms for strengthening for multi-stakeholder interaction, collaboration alignment, and visioning to address the root causes and barriers highlighted. These project processes will further refine and highlight the strategic roles of key actors to collectively contribute to the project's outcomes. A summary of the respective roles is outlined below:

- **Government:** The government plays the crucial role in facilitating the enabling policy and institutional framework to support effective implementation of ILM initiatives. While government agencies may have the respective mandates to address relevant issues at the sectoral level, efforts are needed to streamline vertical (local, state, and national) and horizontal (cross-sectoral) integration. In particular, the Government's role includes consolidating institutional mandates guided by the policy aspirations of respective agencies as well as strengthening mechanisms (e.g., technical guidance, programmes, economic instruments etc.) to support effective adoption of integrated landscape management and sustainable value chain production practices. In addition, government agencies also play a role in facilitating the involvement and participation of various stakeholders (e.g., government, private sector, community) as well as contribute to the access of relevant data or information required needed for project implementation.
- **Private sector:** The private sector plays a key role to provide insights and feedback to improve existing value chain production practices as well as guide the refinement of future programmes (including traceability tools, improved connection amongst producers and buyers, etc). The private sector also plays various leadership roles, including facilitating the empowerment of smallholders through value chain linkages and as well as being a role model for other private sector peers in demonstrating innovating efforts towards effective privately managed conserved areas, particularly involving HCV forests.
- **Cooperatives/community groups:** Cooperatives and community groups play a critical role in ensuring the impact and sustainability of the project initiatives. As direct beneficiaries, apart from being involved in the project's capacity building and training initiatives, they can provide targeted inputs to the development of integrated landscape management plans as well as illustrate traditional knowledge and contribute towards participatory restoration frameworks. In addition, cooperatives and community groups are also able to provide valuable feedback to refine and strengthen existing farmer programmes and initiatives in relation to sustainable agriculture. Where possible the project will build upon the momentum and pathways that have been built from previous projects (e.g., EU REDD+).
- **NGOs:** Various NGOs have initiated collaboration and efforts in relation to integrated landscape management and sustainable value chain production in Sabah. The NGOs could contribute lessons learned for the project to adapt to the project landscapes while facilitating the engagements of stakeholders at various levels. In addition, the NGOs could contribute by providing various capacities and technical support to strengthen the implementation of the project. The NGOs also play a vital role as project co-financers as well as key partners to ensure the sustainability of the project initiatives beyond the project time frame.

The *Stakeholder Engagement Plan* (Annex 7 to the Project Document) provides further details of their respective roles.

Q7. The following narrative has been added to Section III (Strategy) of the Project Document, under the Summary of project approaches (Leverage of systemic change through value chains) sub-section. The same narrative was added to the CEO ER in the Project Justification Section, under the Summary of project approaches (Leverage of systemic change through value chain) sub-section.

Under Output 3.2, the project will build upon the current framework and initiatives in Malaysia supporting green financing especially in the agriculture and oil palm sector. This includes raising the awareness amongst project stakeholders on the efforts of the Joint Committee on Climate Change (JC3 - Bank Negara Malaysia, Securities Commission, Bursa Malaysia and industry players) through various Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) initiatives, including the Value-based Investment Community of Practitioners (and the Value-based Intermediation Financing and Investment Impact Assessment Framework (VBIAF) Sectoral Guidance on Palm Oil), Greening the Value Chain Program and various initiatives to strengthen the management of climate-related risks. The project will also engage the relevant financial institutions (government and private sector) to explore potential collaboration and partnership to strengthen financial flows towards sustainable production initiatives. It will also work internationally on sustainable finance for palm oil from RSPO, UNPRI (PRI Investor Working Group on Sustainable Palm Oil) and others.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

Yes ? summaries of baseline situation for different components are sound and with clear link to existing projects, including challenges associated with sector-centric development plans that lack integration framework, lack of incentives to promote sustainable value chains and resilient finance that promote sustainable practices for smallholders and implement jurisdictional approach, and public-private-community partnership to restore and connect areas of valuable forest for wildlife. Details provided in Annexes 7, 14, 15 and 16 give further convincing information.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

YES ? the alternative scenario has been structured with a full description of each outcome and corresponding outputs, followed by the incremental reasoning sub-section.

The overall strategy involves engaging in simultaneous efforts to develop the leadership capacity and collaboration capacity of stakeholders in planning and managing land together,

to restore-rehabilitate HCV/HCS ecosystems for connectivity, to diversify and strengthen smallholder livelihoods, and to facilitate sustainable and resilient palm oil value chains.

Q8. Please further describe in practical details the role of private sector since we still believe that PS role still not clearly fleshed out or lacks practical details.

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

Q8. The project strategy includes a dedicated output on engagement with the private sector (Output 3.2: Strengthened linkages and collaboration through the value chain). The main objective of Output 3.2 is to strengthen cross-sector collaboration and public private partnerships to deliver more systemic, sector-wider solutions for sustainability challenges in the palm oil sector, including traceability, farmer training and support, environmental monitoring, labour standards, forest protection and conservation initiatives and finance for sustainable value chains. In addition, Output 2.1 aims to develop a roadmap for recognizing the management of conservation areas and 2.2 focuses on fiscal and economic instrument recommendations to facilitate landscape level finance in providing an innovative framework for engaging and catalyzing greater private sector involvement in conservation and sustainable production practices.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes ? this clearly developed and aligned.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

The incremental reasoning for each outcome and corresponding outputs is sound.

Q9. Please further describe the incremental reasoning for this project, that directly responds to threat/barriers as identified

For example, the role of local government local NGOs and private sector under component 1 still a bit weak in implementing multi-stakeholder coordination. Co-financing from different sources have been clearly developed, especially from the government. As said before, private sector co-financing still very low and we expect a concrete PS engagement during the implementation.

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

Q9. The project Theory of Change narrative has been amended with the following entry:

In addition to the opportunities for private sector co-financing through direct commitments to forest conservation and restoration, partly motivated by RSPO and MSPO requirements and PS leadership in sustainable production through Outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 3.2, the proposed development of an online platform for data sharing focusing on restoration (Output 5.4) is expected to provide open access information to empower and consolidate the efforts of local government, NGO and private sector based on informed priorities and restoration needs. At the same time, it is aimed at attracting new collaborators and contributors to support the sustainability of restoration efforts across the project landscape.

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

YES ? the project is well elaborated and aligned to achieve GEB and adaptation benefits. However, how other crops/livestock that create major externalities are considered within the framework of ILM across the key intervention areas is poorly mentioned.

Agency Response

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

YES ? we see two important areas of innovation being described, including (1) the Open Innovation Challenge (please correct paragraph 2 that mentions Indonesia instead of Malaysia) and (2) systems leadership approach with leaders or sustainability champions. Innovation still policy and institutions oriented, and we encourage business model, technological, and financing innovations to be clearly demonstrated during the implementation.

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

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

YES ? this is well documented under the Project Document Table5

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

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

YES

Agency Response

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

4/27/2023 PU

UNILEVER's commitment is mentioned as co-financier in supporting the institutionalization of the secretariat for Sabah Jurisdictional Approach initiative. However, this has to be confirmed and letter presented. In absence of such confirmation, the GEFSEC can't approve the project. Alternatively, please remove.

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

YES ? UNILEVER's commitment is mentioned as co-financier in supporting the institutionalization of the secretariat for Sabah Jurisdictional Approach initiative.

Please provide information on the role of private sector beyond co-financing (see Q8).

Q10. How are the financing institutions currently involved? What role do they play in terms provisions for sustainable financing?

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

Q10. The Private Sector Engagement section in the CEO ER has been amended with the following narrative:

Under Output 3.2, the project will engage with existing finance initiatives, including the Value-based Investment Community of Practitioners (and the Value-based Intermediation Financing and Investment Impact Assessment Framework (VBIAF) Sectoral Guidance on Palm Oil), and will work internationally on sustainable finance for palm oil from RSPO, UNPRI (PRI Investor Working Group on Sustainable Palm Oil) and others.

The project provides a platform for the programs and initiatives related to ESG by key financial institutions in Malaysia to be tested and refined through its application of newly developed guidelines for the private sector. Low-value grants are proposed especially for smallholders and communities under outputs 4.3, 5.1 and 5.3 to facilitate and strengthen partnerships between the private sector, tertiary institutions and local communities.

In addition, the project initiatives provide a platform for private sector engagement to inform the development of the road map related to private sector governed Conserved Areas in the project landscape.

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

YES ? this is documented in Annex 5 and 12 of the Project Document

Agency Response

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

YES

Agency Response

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

YES ? and a short narrative has been provided.

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

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

To some extent.

According to GEF policy, Agencies are required in the CEO ER ?to elaborate a budget, timeline and specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables as well as plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives, evaluations and best practices during implementation following the policy?. Q11. Could you add some additional information on budget, timeline and specific deliverables expected should be added.

Agency Response

UNDP, Response 17 April 2023

Q11. The Knowledge Management section in the CEO ER has been amended with the following narrative.

Knowledge management will be overseen by a full-time Communications Officer. A budget of USD 491,620 allocated for Output 6.2 (Knowledge sharing for replication of best practice nationally and internationally through FOLUR global platform and UNDP Green Commodities Programme, and participation in the global IP framework events and activities). The project Communications and Knowledge Management Strategy and Action Plan will be developed in the first year of project implementation. Following development of this document, project internet and social media platforms will be established, awareness raising activities will be initiated and the project will participate in workshops, conferences, seminars and other events to both gain and share knowledge. An estimated ten (10) knowledge products (four of which will highlight gender mainstreaming outcomes), twenty (20) communication pieces/stories, and four (4) written and/or audio-visual records of traditional knowledge products will be produced. As part of the FOLUR Community of Practice, the project budget includes participation of project stakeholders in three (3) global events and three (3) regional events. Moreover, the Malaysia country project will host two FOLUR events, estimated to occur in years 3 and 5 of the project. Through these FOLUR Community of Practice events, the project will generate an estimated ten (10) press reports and two (2) country reports to be disseminated nationally.

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

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

YES ? through 54,000 direct beneficiaries of which 27,000 women, but also described several socioeconomic benefits.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YES

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request YES - and adequate

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The CEO ER submission is strong and has responded very well to the detailed upstream comments provided by the GEF Sec FOLUR team in 2020. The project will be sent back to the Agency to address a number of questions (11 questions in total) and few comments before we recommend CEO Endorsement for the project.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request YES

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

YES

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/5/2023

Reference of non-confirmed co-financing from Unilever removed from Project Document and annexes. This co-financing will be reported at MTR, if materialized during project implementation.

4/27/2023 PU

The co-financing confirmation from UNILEVER is needed for CEO Endorsement.

4/25/2023 PU

This project is technically cleared for CEO Endorsement

No, this project is not yet technically cleared for CEO Endorsement.

The project will be sent back to the Agency to address a number of questions (11 questions in total) and few comments from the GEF Secretariat before we recommend CEO Endorsement for the project.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/9/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/21/2023	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

5/5/2023

Reference of non-confirmed co-financing from Unilever removed from Project Document and annexes. This co-financing will be reported at MTR, if materialized during project implementation.

4/27/2023 PU

The co-financing confirmation from UNILEVER is needed for CEO Endorsement.

4/25/2023 PU

Cleared

The CEO ER re-submission is very strong and has responded very well to the detailed questions and comments provided by the GEF Secretariat. Therefore, I recommend CEO's Endorsement.