



Strengthening Ecosystem Restoration Investments in Madagascar

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11139

Countries

Madagascar

Project Name

Strengthening Ecosystem Restoration Investments in Madagascar

Agencies

UNEP, CI

Date received by PM

8/15/2024

Review completed by PM

10/2/2024

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Clarification required:

- CI is listed as Implementing Agency. Please clarify if that is still the case.

09/19/2024: The clarification provided below is well-noted. However, CI is still listed in Part I of the portal template. Please remove or let us know if the filed cannot be changed so that we can fix that from the backend.

09/23/2024: Has been clarified. If needed, CI to be removed by ITS.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

CI is no longer listed as Implemented Agency. The functionality in the portal was disabled at the time of the submission of the CEO endorsement package and the change could not be effected. Indeed, CI worked as co-executing agency with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (Executing agency) during the PPG phase and will continue as lead technical partner in one or more Technical Assistance Facility (TAF) defined for the execution of the project at landscape level. This change has been confirmed in the Madagascar GEF OFP endorsement letter submitted with the CEO endorsement package.

09/23/2024

Please note that we are unable to remove CI as co-implementing agency in the portal as that functionality is disabled. Kindly fix that from the backend. Thank you.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

- Please consider switching the Land Degradation marker from Significant to Principal given restoration is at the core of the project objective

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The Land Degradation marker has been changed from Significant to Principal in the portal.

2. Project Summary.

- a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

- The summary exceeds the word limit by far. Please make it concise. There is no need to describe the activities at different levels in the summary.

- Please add the main GEBs that will be generated, consistent with core indicator targets.

09/19/2024: Perfectly addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The project summary has been shortened to 248 words.

A brief description of the project's contribution to GEBs has been included in the summary

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and**

consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

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

f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

on d) gender: please budget the gender-related activities.

on d) M&E: The M&E component has no outcomes, outputs, or budget allocation. However, project component 4 is named "Monitoring and Evaluation, Knowledge, and Learning", and there is one output related to M&E. Please (i) separate M&E from KM (component 4) and (ii) add outcomes / outputs and budget to M&E component (we will review the budget vis-?-vis this table per the resubmission).

on f) PMC not proportional, please amend.

Note: If the GEF contribution is kept at %, for a co-financing of \$69,223,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,461,150 instead of \$149,104 (which is 0.2%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional.

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The budget for gender-related activities (US\$172,500) is provided in the project's Gender Action Plan (GAP, Annex H1 ? Page 90 in the revised CEO Endorsement Package and Page 38 in the Annex C and consolidation of appendices).

The corresponding budget items for the gender-related activities in the GAP are highlighted (in yellow) in the overall project budget (in Annex G).

As requested, project Component 4 has been split into a KM and Communication component (component 4) and a dedicated M&E component (component 5).

Component 4 has been designed for communication, knowledge management and linkages with the Global Ecosystem Restoration IP. Output 4.1.1 will enable the collection, collation, hosting and maintenance of the project data and information that will be required to monitor and report on project performance. Output 4.1.2 will ensure the linkages between the child project and the Global Ecosystem Restoration IP.

Component is dedicated to Project Monitoring and Evaluation through an integrated and gender-sensitive M&E framework. Output 5.1.1 will support the design and operationalization of an M&E system and the project baseline for future impact monitoring and assessment. Output 5.1.2 develop and implement a M&E plan at the Child project level including the objective, outcome, output, gender and environmental and social safeguard indicators.

A specific workplan and budget (corresponding to US\$287,578 or 2% for projects above US\$10M) has been prepared for the project's Monitoring and Evaluation activities. Please see Appendix 6, Page 71 of Annex C and consolidation of appendices.

Project Component 4 is fully aligned with Outcome 4.2 and 4.3 of Component 4 of the GEF-approved Ecosystem Restoration Program Framework Document (PFD).

Project Component 4 is also fully aligned with Component 4 of the original GEF-8 Child Project Concept for Madagascar.

The budget for Component 4, and the distribution of the budget ? by individual costs - across outputs is presented in the overall project budget (in Annex G).

The value of co-financing commitment to the PMC has been adjusted to reflect it as a proportional contribution.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

5 B. Project Description

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

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

- what is not fully clear is how, exactly, local communities and smallholders will be supported in "enhancement of rural livelihoods" (as stated in the project's objective). The text, for example, states that "The project will provide professional, technical and financial support to smallholder crop and livestock farmers to help them improve the sustainability and productivity of their farming practices." Please explain how this support, especially the financial support, will be provided and how it is reflected in the budget. For example, which budget lines support outputs 1.1.5 and 2.2.1 ?

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

For ease of reference, the suite of project activities that will support the enhancement of rural livelihoods have been highlighted in the GEF Request for FSP Child CEO Endorsement (in yellow on page 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29 and 34).

This support will include *inter alia*: targeted training and skills development; agricultural extension services; professional and technical advisory services; supply of materials, goods, equipment and facilities; grant funding; micro-loans; additional revenue income streams; market access; weather-based risk insurance; sub-contracting and employment.

Project support to enhancement of rural livelihoods will be facilitated through the project-contracted Technical Assistance Facilities (TAFs) located in each of the project landscapes. The implementation modality for delivering this support may vary from landscape to landscape to help build on, and ensure complementarity with, existing donor funded initiatives already underway in these areas.

Implementation modalities by these TAFs may include *inter alia*: direct technical and professional support; sub-contracting service providers; direct procurement of equipment, materials goods and supplies; direct employment; retained "master farmers"; small grants schemes; input voucher schemes; micro-credit schemes; community savings group contributions; Farmer Field Schools; credit guarantees; and agricultural subsidies.

The project budget is structured by UNEP Budget Line (row) and by Output (column), so that the budget lines supporting each output (including Outputs 1.1.5 and 2.2.1) can be identified. The budget line items are further broken down by landscape so that a total budget commitment for each landscape can be elaborated.

At project inception the project EA and the PSC will identify the selected TAF for each landscape. As an integral part of finalizing the contractual agreement with each TAF, a more

detailed budget will be prepared to guide the funding allocations to individual activities (including activities linked to rural enhancement) under each output.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

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

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

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

09/19/2024: Editorial comment: The same diagram for the organizational structure of the project is presented twice.

09/23/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

09/23/2024

The duplicated diagram has now been removed. Thank you

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and

additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: No.

- The core indicator table is missing targets for CI-3 and CI-6 at CEO endorsement. The minimum expectation is that the project will confirm the level of targets that were promised at PIF stage.
- In the uploaded EX-ACT tracking sheet, the total GHG to be avoided under the project are on the higher side of the spectrum. Please consider a more conservative approach for the estimation of the emissions avoided by for instance adjusting the total duration of the accounting to 20 years (5 years for the implementation phase and 15 years for the capitalization phase) instead of 25 years.
- Please explain in the methodological section on Core Indicator the decrease in hectares covered under CI1 while the same two PAs continue to be supported.
- Under CI1, please provide the METT Scores for the two PAs covered.
- The Indicators worksheet seems to be uploaded under HCVF justification by mistake. Please remove as appropriate.

09/19/2024: Not fully addressed.

- The target at CEO endorsement stage for core indicator 3 is still set at zero (0.00 ha). Please double check again the core indicator table in the portal, it currently shows only targets at PIF level for CI 3.

09/23/2024: Not fully addressed.

- The target at CEO endorsement for core indicator 11 (beneficiaries) is still set at zero (0). PLEASE DOUBLE CHECK ALL INDICATOR TARGETS.

10/02/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The core indicator table is presented in Part B of the Request documentation. It includes the targets for CI-3 and CI-6.

Annex C and the GEF-8 Core Indicator Results Measurement Framework Worksheet further elaborates on the targets for these core indicators (including Core indicator 1.2 and Core Indicator 3.1 and 3.2).

The estimations for GHG emissions avoided have been reviewed and revised to adjust for the period of accounting. The FAO EX-ACT tracking sheet and the relevant sections of the documentation have been updated to reflect this adjustment.

While a brief explanation was originally provided for the decrease in hectareage in core indicator 1 and the concomitant increase in core indicator 3, this explanation has been further elaborated. The total area-based project targets for the indicators however remain the same as committed in the Child Project Concept.

The METT scorecards were uploaded to the portal under Appendix 12D (and embedded in 11139 Annex C and consolidation of Appendices Page 118). The baseline and targets for the METTs are further elaborated in Annex C and the GEF-8 Core Indicator Results Measurement Framework Worksheet.

The GEF-8 Core Indicator Results Measurement Framework Worksheet has been uploaded to the portal.

09/23/2024

This has now been corrected in the portal where the core indicator 3 at CEO endorsement stage is 93,852 ha.

09/30/2024

This has now been addressed in the portal. There are 54,000 beneficiaries including 27,054 females and 26,946 males.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

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

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes, as part of the project document annexes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes, as part of the project document annexes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Please clarify if required safeguards document has been uploaded.

09/19/2024: Uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Yes. The safeguards document named ?11139 UNEP SRIF Form? (with a draft ESMF embedded) has been uploaded on the portal under Annex F. Another version is also attached in the list of documents uploaded in that section of the portal.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

(mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes. However, except for the co-financing letter from CI, the remaining seven co-financing letters are provided in French. Please provide an English translation of these letters as per the GEF Co-financing Policy. While a formal translation is not required, the translation should be done to the best of the Agency's capacity.

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The translated versions from French to English of all the co-financing commitment letters are provided in Appendix 15 (Page 130 of Annex C and consolidation of Appendices) and uploaded to the portal under the name ?11139 GEF Annex C and compilation of Appendices_12 Sept 2024?.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Yes.

- Please make sure core indicator targets are consistent in the results framework and the core indicator table.

- While this has been adequately described in the project proposal, please confirm that during implementation, the child project is expected to report to program level indicators that are outlined in the Global Coordination Project to facilitate a programmatic M&E of the Integrated Program and that the necessary arrangements are made to enable the child project to report to these indicators.

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The core indicator targets in the results framework, the core indicator table, and the GEF-8 Core Indicator Results Measurement Framework Worksheet have been cross-checked to ensure consistency.

The links between the project-level indicators and the relevant program-level indicators (ERIP GCP #) are shown in Column 2 of the table in Annex C. It is confirmed that the project will report on its contribution to the program level indicators outlined in the GCP.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

The GeoName IDs do not seem to be available under the format of the <https://www.geonames.org/> platform. Please update as appropriate.

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The GeoName IDs have been updated in the resubmission package and in the portal, especially the latitudes. The longitude and latitude follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format (Decimal degrees) which Agencies are encouraged to use in the PIR reporting with at least at least four decimal points for greater accuracy.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Please confirm if the document has been uploaded.

09/19/2024: Uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Yes. The document named UNEP SRIF has been uploaded as indicated in section 7.4 of this review sheet.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: Not fully.

- Office supplies and rental of furnished and equipped office space should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components. Please adjust the budget accordingly.

- Please amend the differences between the budget table and the Portal's component table as follows, they should match.

	Budget table	Portal's component table	Difference
Component 1	1,850,000	1,850,000	-
Component 2	9,301,000	9,173,000	128,000
Component 3	1,806,000	1,936,000	(130,000)
Component 4	737,189	735,189	2,000
PMC	684,709	684,709	-
Total	14,378,898	14,378,898	-

09/19/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

09/18/2024

The budget line item "Rental of furnished and equipped office space for PCU" has been charged 100% to PMC (in green in the budget sheet Cell No S196). This has also been amended in the portal.

The budget table and the Portal's component table have been amended.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

09/18/2024

Noted

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

09/19/2024: No. Please address outstanding issues as noted in the review sheet.

Further, in the re-submission, the yellow highlights in the portal template can now be removed, the reviewer has taken note of the changes/highlights, thank you.

Please also upload a public version of the project document including Annexes for eventual circulation to GEF Council.

09/23/2024: No. Please double check all indicators targets at CEO endorsement stage again. The project has no beneficiaries.

10/02/2024: Yes. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement (after the 4-weeks circulation period).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/20/2024:

- During project implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

- Please ensure that no GEF Council comments provided at parent PFD approval (#11118) are relevant for this child project.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/20/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/19/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	9/23/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		