

# Greater Port Vila Urban Resilience Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10745

**Countries**

Vanuatu

**Project Name**

Greater Port Vila Urban Resilience Project

**Agencies**

ADB

**Date received by PM**

7/26/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/23/2021

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**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

10/5/2021:

Cleared.

9/29/2021:

Adjustments are requested. The project duration is shown as 60 months. However, there are only 52 months between the expected implementation start date and the expected completion date. Please revise.

9/7/2021:

Cleared.

8/3/2021:

Not yet.

Please correct the expected start and completion dates in the Project Information section.

#### Agency Response

ADB Response 05 October 2021

Expected implementation start and completion dates have been modified to match the 60 month project duration.

ADB Response 03 September 2021

The start and completion dates have been clarified.

## 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

10/5/2021:

Cleared.

Update, 9/29/2021:

Adjustment is requested.

The proportionality of PMC needs to be adjusted. If the GEF PMC contribution is kept at 4.9%, then for a co-financing of \$12,040,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$589,960 (to reach the same proportion) instead of \$430,000 (which is 3.5%). As the costs associated with the project management need to 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/or the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level.

9/20/2021:

Cleared.

9/14/2021:

Not yet. For Components that seek LDCF financing but include some outputs that will be fully ADB-financed, please clarify in Table B, by adding a clarification in brackets for specific sub-components/outputs, that LDCF financing will not be applied to it.

8/5/2021:

Not yet.

- a) Please discuss the adaptation rationale for sub-component 1.4.
- b) For sub-component 1.7, please ensure the LDCF funding is used for sharing climate-resilience related information, and that co-finance is used for information-sharing on other issues.
- c) Component 2 has been labeled 'Investment', but it is not clear how the activities are investments. They appear to be soft measures and assessments.
- d) Please apply the LDCF grant only for climate and disaster resilience related activities under Component 2.
- e) Will climate resilience considerations (including climate projections) be applied to the design and construction of the three emergency shelters,?
- f) 'Climate-proofing' of the shelters and/or other infrastructure, where business-as-usual investments are adjusted to take climate change into account, should be part of the

baseline financing as due diligence by the agency. However, infrastructure that is sited, designed and constructed with climate resilience as a running consideration may be supported by the LDCF (as long as they do not trigger resettlement or other environmental/social safeguards).

g) Understood that Component 4 will be entirely ADB-financed. However, an LDCF amount is shown in Table B, presumably for the last sub-component (M&E). Perhaps it is better to separate this, so that no LDCF funding corresponds to Component 4.

h) Please provide sources for all the various climate change projections in Table B. Is it possible to provide projections and/or expected impacts in 30 year timeframe, instead of to 2100?

#### Agency Response

##### ADB Response 05 October 2021

The co-financing contribution to PMC has been strengthened to a total of approximately \$640,000, or 5.3 % of the total co-financing (of \$12.47 million). This is adjusted in Table C and in the table in section 1.A.(v).

##### ADB Response 20 September 2021

GEF LDCF funding will not be applied under Component 4: Asset Management and Institutional Capacity Strengthened. A clarification bracket was added to the component.

##### ADB Response 03 September 2021

**Note: additional co-finance of \$0.7 million has been mobilized** from the Ireland Trust Fund for Building Climate Change and Disaster Resilience in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) ? referred to as ?ITF?. This additional co-financing is to be used to:

- (i) Enhance community climate risk management through the preparation of two ward level ?Climate Urban Resilience Plans? in Output 2. **? SEE New Activity 2.2.** This process will be driven by civil society. LDCF will also contribute to these Plans - \$125k of LDCF has been transferred from Output 3 to support this. This process will also play a role in ensuring the project reduces/addresses gender inequalities, especially through climate change;

- (ii) Contribute to the construction of the shelters under Output 3. This ensures that, despite the lowering of LDCF contribution to that construction, the overall resources allocated to the construction has increased by \$500k.

Project financing figures have been **MODIFIED** in all tables in Part I, and at various points in the text (e.g. the table in Section 1.A.(v)).

Overall climate rationale for LDCF support to activities under Output 1 and 2 is further elaborated at several points in the text, notably at the end of the description of Outputs 1 and 2.

- a) Although this sub-component 1.4 is financed by ADB co-financing, it will contribute to climate resilience (LDCF may provide limited technical advice through general technical support mechanisms ? but no LDCF input specific to this component).

Sub-component 1.4 will lead to the provision of basic information necessary for asset management, asset maintenance and asset insurance, all of which are essential basis for disaster risk management, and this will become increasingly essential as the climate risks increase. In the baseline, the incomplete and inaccurate nature of the property asset register means PVMC cannot plan maintenance, cannot prioritize investments and cannot enter into effective insurance arrangements. This undermines disaster risk management. Sub-component 1.4 will include undertaking a detailed review the current status of the property values register in PVMC , so enhancing PVMC ability to review its valuation base. SEE **Modifications** made in the barrier analysis (point (iii)) and in the description of Sub-component 1.4.

- b) This was indeed the intention. The ADB baseline project will create the information flow/dissemination platform, and the LDCF funds will be used to ensure that climate-resilience and climate change related information is shared and disseminated through that platform. SEE **Modifications** to the introduction and to point (i) at end of the description of Output 1.

- c) Component 2 should not be investment but technical assistance. This has been corrected in table B.

- d) This was indeed the intention. SEE **Modifications** This has been clarified and emphasized in the description of the LDCF contributions to both Outputs 1 and 2.

- e) Yes. SEE **Modification to Output 3.2**. In line with ADB climate risk requirements, all investments are designed to be resilient to future climate projections. This is assured through the ?climate risk assessment process?.

f) in order to clarify: the shelters are a response to the increasing climate disaster risk in Port Vila due to climate change, they are to provide shelter to vulnerable people during future climate events, and hence it can be argued that the *entire* cost of the shelters may be eligible for climate change adaptation finance. In addition, the shelters are to be designed so that the infrastructure is climate resilient ? i.e. it will be built to withstand future storms, winds and flooding events. This growing threat is detailed in the table in the Sub -section ?climate change and climate hazards?. This is emphasized SEE **Modification to** introductory description under Output 3.

Note: also, no significant environmental or social issues are envisaged, as the shelters are to be constructed on land already owned by local authorities with existing infrastructure for other purposes. Appropriate safeguards are to be taken, in line with ADB Policy, practices and procedures (see Section 11 on Safeguards).

g) A new line item has been created in the Table B for M&E to address this concern.

h) Done. See revised Table in the Sub -section ?climate change and hazards? in Section 1.A.(i). In addition, the text preceding this Table provides a justification for the use of 2090 figures.

**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 10/5/2021:

Cleared.

Update, 9/29/2021:

Further information is requested.

In the description of Investment Mobilized, please provide the overall financing plans of the two sources (ADB project and Irish Government TA).

8/3/2021:

Yes. A request for extension had been submitted for this project, and an explanation provided that the COVID-19 situation had affected the financing envelope and scope of ADB's baseline project. The submitted CER and co-finance letters reflect the current situation.

Agency Response

ADB Response 05 October 2021

Information has been added under Table C as to how the co-finance from the Government of Ireland was mobilised.

Co-financing support documentation has been added to the Evidence tag in Table C section of the Portal.

**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

8/3/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

**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 9/14/2021:

Cleared.

8/5/2021:

Not yet.

PPG was not requested, yet a "true" value shows above the Table F for the PPG request. The agency is requested to de-select any boxes indicating PPG was requested.

Agency Response

ADB Response 03 September 2021

Actually "zero PPG" was requested in order to create the CER document. Please see the email communications with PPO on this matter, which is uploaded in the "Roadmap" section.

**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

9/21/2021:

Cleared.

9/20/2021:

Not yet:

(i) Please correct the value for Core indicator #1 in the Portal entry; it should be 20,000.

(ii) The note below Table F in the Portal entry, which pertains to the LDCF indicators, states that 960 ha of land will be managed for climate resilience. Please capture this in the Core Indicator table (indicator #2) of the Portal entry as well. Also in the Excel sheet.

(iii) In the explanatory note below Table F, please include a brief explanation for the lower percentage of women (relative to man) who will be trained on climate risks and adaptation by this project.

8/5/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

ADB Response 21 September 2021

(i) Core Indicator #1 in the portal has been corrected.

(ii) added 960 hectares of urban landscapes, captured in the portal and excel

(iii) An explanatory note on the lower percentage of women has been added in the portal and excel.



**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

8/5/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2021:

Yes.

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

8/5/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

**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

8/5/2021:

Yes.

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

8/11/2021:

Yes.

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

8/3/2021:

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

8/5/2021:

Yes, the agency has provided a theory of change as well as a table outlining how the child project outputs contribute to the overall program.

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

9/7/2021:

Cleared. Thank you for the additional information.

8/11/2021:

Not yet. We would welcome a stronger role for NGOs and CSOs in design and implementation of this project. At present, the CEO Endorsement entry states that civil society will be consulted only. Would it be possible to include more formal advisory/implementation arrangements for them?

### Agency Response

[ADB Response 03 September 2021](#)

Although the CEO endorsement request did state that civil society will be consulted, the involvement of civil society is not *restricted* to consultation. The Portal indication on role of CSOs has been amended.

Civil society has a strong role to play in the project, particularly in three sub-Components 1.6, 2.1 and 2.4. The PCU will be mandated and staffed to develop this collaboration. SEE **Modification**: Section 2d has been clarified, and Annex J has been modified.

In addition, the new Output 2.2 (i.e. two ward level, community driven, Climate Urban Resilience Plans) is to be delivered entirely by civil society. A contract will be issued through an NGO (open to international bidding) and all activities will be driven by NGOs, local civil society and community-based organizations, as appropriate.

Annex J has been updated to reflect these considerations, see in particular the "Proposed Project Participation and Consultation Strategy"

### 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

10/5/2021:

Cleared.

Update, 9/29/2021:

Further information is requested.

(i) Please clarify whether a gender analysis has been carried out.

(ii) The project indicates that it expects to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, but it is unclear from the submission including the gender action plan (or indicators) what activities are planned to address these issues. Please review the gender action plan and/or revise the tag selection in the Gender section for 'Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources'.

9/14/2021:

Cleared.

8/11/2021:

Not yet. Please provide further information on the particular ways in which climate change exacerbates women's vulnerability, and how the project will seek to reduce/address these, and render them more resilient.

## Agency Response

[ADB Response 05 October 2021](#)

(i) Yes. Combined Social, Poverty and Gender Assessment was completed in mid-2020. This is now provided as Appendix 4 (note the assessment refers to the project's former name, i.e.: Port Vila Integrated Urban Improvements Project.)

(ii) No modifications have been made to the current tagging. Below is some rationale:

Several activities will contribute to this gender objective, although mostly indirectly, and that is not the primary aim of the activity. Examples are provided in the following table:

Project Activity	How the activity contributes to 'Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources'
1.3 PVMC Corporate Plan updated to include urban resilience targets/actions and gender targets/actions. This will include ensuring the Plan covers urban resilience actions, climate change and gender (e.g., actions support women in the workplace, including women in leadership and technical roles, based on sex-disaggregated data and analysis).	Overall, this will lead to women having more control over their lives, as they receive training, and as gender empowerment is institutionalized through actions of PVMC. This will include improved access to clean air, freshwater, mangroves and other marine/coastal resources.
1.6 Greater Port Vila Liveable City Action Plan. This will include climate resilience, and include specific safety and <u>access measures for women</u> , children, and people living with disabilities.	Implementation of the Liveable City Action Plan will ensure all residents, with focus on women, have better access to clean air, fresh water, and will also have access to <i>sustainable</i> use of marine and coastal resources. Women, through training, will be empowered to have better control over this access.
2.2 Two ward level Climate Urban Resilience Plans.	As stated in the document, sub-activities <i>will include assessing gender status in the wards, assessing impacts of climate change on gender, identifying specific gender related climate change needs, and providing the tools and training needed to ensure the two Climate Urban Resilience Plans contribute optimally to mainstreaming gender and addressing gender inequalities</i> . Overall this is going to empower women, and give them the tools to have better access to natural resources.

The gender analysis has been strengthened. See **additional text** in section 3 (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment).

Attention is also drawn to the Box in the sub-section 'vulnerability considerations' in Section 1.A.(i)

Further details have been provided on the projects' response to gender challenges, notably through implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP). See **additional text** towards the end of section 3 (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment).

Notably, Activities 2.2 and 2.3 include a particular gender focus. See **Modification** in the description of these activities.

Finally, it is also noted that there is a gender focal point in the Project Coordination Unit who is tasked with the coordination and implementation of the gender action plan (see existing wording for Activity 4.1).

### **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

8/11/2021:

Yes. Vanuatu's high vulnerability to external shocks has constrained private sector growth, so that the public sector dominates. However, the project will engage and support the private sector by: (i) consulting with the Vanuatu Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Vanuatu Institute of Technology to explore new technologies and private sector opportunities; (ii) engaging with local businesses, stall owners and other microenterprises during the planning and design of infrastructure (e.g., multipurpose centers that include marketplace and area improvements); (iii) using qualified contractors to build new, resilient infrastructure; (iv) seeking tenders from a large number of large local companies and locally registered international companies of sufficient size to deliver the works; and (v) the procurement of building materials, partners in decision-making, as design advisors, and/or as funding co-contributors (e.g. local businesses and tourist operators).

### 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

10/5/2021:

Cleared. The agency has revised the risk rating and attached relevant plans to address potential risks.

Update, 9/29/2021:

Clarification is requested.

The agency has classified the project ESS risk as low in the Portal, and has attached the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) including an environmental management plan (EMP) and Resettlement Plan. However, the IEE and Resettlement Plan state that the project is categorized as category B, which is equivalent as risk category 'moderate' instead of low risk. Please clarify whether the overall ESS risk is low, as stated in the Portal.

9/15/2021:

Cleared.

8/5/2021:

Not yet. A Risk table has been included, with risk mitigation measures proposed, and we note that the Climate & Disaster Risk Screening and ESS documentation have also been uploaded. However:

- i) Please confirm that LDCF activities will not be financing resettlement activities.
- ii) Please provide examples of potential ways in which the project might assist with green recovery and building back better in the context of Covid-19, even if these have not been fully assessed/elaborated yet.

## Agency Response

[ADB Response 05 October 2021](#)

Risk category has been modified to "moderate" / medium.

[ADB Response 03 September 2021](#)

The CER narrative has been modified / clarified.

- i) There will be no resettlement in the project, only potentially a temporary displacement of market vendors during construction (to an alternative, adjacent site).

LDCF will not finance any resettlement activities, temporary or otherwise.

\_ii) Additional information towards the end of the Risks sub-section. Information is provided on the assessments taken so far, the planning steps to be taken, and potential measures to be implemented through the project. There is some additional narrative on relevance to "building back better" in relation to this small project.

### **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

10/5/2021:

Cleared. The agency has listed both co-executing agencies in the Project Information section.

Update, 9/29/2021:

Adjustment is requested.

The project information section shows that the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management will be the executing partner. In the section on Coordination, however, there is discussion of two Ministries carrying out execution functions (Ministry of Finance and Economic Management (MFEM), and Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIA)). Please clarify this section, so that it is clear which agency is carrying out project execution functions.

9/15/2021:

Cleared.

8/11/2021:

Please also coordinate with LDCF ID 8018 (Building Resilience of Health Systems in Pacific Island LDCs), under implementation.

#### Agency Response

ADB Response 05 October 2021

Part of this stems from ADB terminology which uses the terms "implementing agency" and "executing agency" differently than the GEF. In essence, for GEF purposes, we would have 2 GEF **Co-Executing Agencies**. The roles and responsibilities of each of the co-executors are separated by function in the inserted table in the main CER document (in highlight), and also Annex L.

ADB Response 03 September 2021



Done. See **added** paragraph in section 6b (Coordination with Other Projects, notably GEF 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

9/15/2021:

Cleared.

8/11/2021:

Not yet. It is aligned with Vanuatu's Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (2016-2030), and Goal 3 (Climate and Disaster Resilience) of Vanuatu's National Sustainable Development Plan (2016-2030).

However, the agency is requested to also discuss alignment with Vanuatu's 3rd National Communications to the UNFCCC (Dec. 2020).

Agency Response

[ADB Response 03 September 2021](#)

Done. See **added** paragraph in Section 7 (Consistency with National Priorities).

#### **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

9/15/2021:

Cleared.

8/11/2021:

Not yet.

Please also specify that lessons will be collected and shared on the experience with the climate-resilient shelters, including:

- a) How climate-resilience was integrated into the design of the shelters; and
- b) While we sincerely hope there will not be occasion for their near-term use, in the event that their use is necessary, please ensure measures are in place to document how

they were able to successfully meet community needs in terms of access, safety, potable water, and other emergency needs. Please also ensure that shortcomings would be documented, with a view to improved design of future shelters.

#### Agency Response

ADB Response 03 September 2021

Indeed the approach to multipurpose evacuation centres is innovative and lessons will be learnt regarding their design, construction, utilization and limitations. This, and the mechanisms through which the lessons will be learnt (notably Activity 1.7, and the ADB sponsored regional platforms and the PRIF) has been emphasized.

SEE **Modification** to the description of Activity 1.7, and in Section 8 (Knowledge Management) ? both the ?in-country? and ?regionally, and beyond? sections.

#### **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

9/15/2021:

Cleared.

8/11/2021:

Not yet. Please include in the Portal template a table with rows depicting the budgeted M&E Plan activities.

#### Agency Response

ADB Response 03 September 2021

**Additional information** has been provided on monitoring in Section 9. This includes a detailed M+E plan and a breakdown of costs.

And see also the revised excel sheet and annex J.

#### **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

8/11/2021:

Yes. Taken in conjunction with the ADB baseline financing, the project will: increase availability of safe places for shelter during natural hazards; improve accessibility to shelters and sanitation for all people (including people with a disability); reduce impacts from flooding; and increase mobility of residents during floods.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/20/2021:

Cleared.

9/15/2021:

Not yet. As this is a child program that will go to LDCF/SCCF Council for comment before it is CEO Endorsed: please ensure that:

(i) Please ensure that all annexes are contained in a single document. These may be appended to the agency project document. If the agency will not be submitting a project document in addition to the Portal Entry, then please ensure that all annexes are in a single PDF file, which should include the Gender Action Plan, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, ToRs for staff, and all other pertinent information for Council review. We can post the LDCF tracking tool separately as an excel file.

(ii) Please ensure that any materials that will be submitted for Council review (Portal entry and annexes) do not contain highlighted text.

8/11/2021:

Not yet. Please see below comments on Annex E (project budget table):

a) It is currently not easy to read, as the formatting is off. Can you please reinsert, with correct formatting?

b) The project budget is not detailed, so it is not possible to understand what budget items are charged to which specific source (M&E, PMC, project components, etc.). The Agency is requested to present the budget in a form that clarifies which item/activity is charged to which source (please note that if the project's staff is charged to project's

components, TORs are required describing the contribution of the project staff to the respective project component).

Agency Response

ADB Response 20 September 2021

A pdf version of the consolidated Annex and a revised excel file of CCA Tracking Tool has been uploaded in the documents roadmap section.

ADB Response 03 September 2021

Both items a) and b) have been addressed in the current revisions.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/11/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/16/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/16/2021:

Yes. However, please delete the rows for pending CEO Endorsement stage comments.

Those will be responded to elsewhere, if/when received.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/16/2021:

Cleared.

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 n/a

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/11/2021:

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

n/a

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

10/5/2021:

Yes, cleared.

Update: 9/29/2021

Not yet. Please address review comments of 9/29/2021.

9/21/2021:

Yes.

9/20/2021:

Not yet. Please see comment on indicators, above.

9/15/2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining review comments:

Part I of the review: item 2

Part II of the review: comments on the Annexes

8/19/2021:

Not yet. The agency is requested to please address comments for the following review items:

Part I of the review: items 1, 2 and 6

Part II of the review: sections on Stakeholders, Gender, Risks, Coordination, Consistency with National Priorities, Knowledge Management, Monitoring & Evaluation, Annexes (Budget), and Council Comments.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/19/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/15/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/20/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/21/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/29/2021</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**