



# Promoting climate-resilience through ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) solutions in the Northern Lao PDR

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
11695

**Countries**  
Lao PDR

**Project Name**  
Promoting climate-resilience through ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) solutions in the Northern Lao PDR

**Agencies**  
UNDP

**Date received by PM**  
12/19/2025

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**  
Tshewang Dorji

**Focal Area**  
Climate Change

**Project Type**  
FSP

**PIF**

**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  
1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**3. Project Description Overview**

**a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

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

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

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

**e) 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  
5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

b).

**Component 1:**

For output 1.1, we refer to the approved PIF, which aims to develop national remote sensing tools to assess risk and vulnerability for comprehensive EBA solutions tailored to local contexts. In this

regard, we respectfully suggest reviewing activities 1.1.1 (a-d) in light of anticipated gaps with existing CIS, with a focus on integrating climate risk and vulnerability in the existing CIS, and the feasibility of establishing a national data management system, informed by the learning from SAMIS and LaCSA. Also, kindly confirm that the current NAP process has been concluded with CIS as one of the output.

Output 1.2: Our understanding is that the scope of regulations or policies is to integrate EbA into operations at the provincial level or sub-national level. Therefore, involving personnel from the national setup, such as NEC, is unnecessary. Additionally, subjecting the outcome of the recently completed NAP process to revision (Act 1.2.1) would be unfortunate and could reflect poorly. We respectfully suggest that activities under this output should also aim to set up mechanisms for introducing and enforcing the agreed regulations or policy directives within the project area at the provincial level, and then develop a plan to apply the lessons learned at the national level.

Output 1.4: Please examine strategies to enhance female participation for availing training and capacity-building opportunities. In addition, kindly provide further information on the 'Training for Trainers' initiative. We suggest to explore particularly on approaches to integrate it within national technical institutions to ensure the programme's long-term sustainability, much beyond the project duration.

## **Component 2**

Output 2.1:

We suggest that that the project adopt a systematic and holistic approach towards implementation of EbA in the project areas. For example, the output 2.1 can be implementation of EbA designed under the output 1.3. Number of sub-activities under the existing output 2.1 can be reviewed as part of formulating the EbA plans under 1.3.

Output 2.2:

We suggest conducting further technical and economic analysis to identify the most effective EbA intervention for the project area, making it a central part of the EbA plan. Additionally, Output 2.2 should go beyond support for preparing bankable EbA plans. Instead, the project resources should be allocated to catalyze SME growth and private sector engagement, which will help generate revenue for sustained project outcomes.

Output 2.3

The activities outlined in this output are not sufficiently clear in terms of how they will achieve the project objective. We suggest removing this section and reallocating resources toward the implementation of EbA plans within the project area.

## **Component 3**

Project learnings should be widely shared to help similar initiatives avoid potential pitfalls. The project can also benefit from insights gained from other investments in the country, such as those GEF and LDCF projects implemented by other agencies. We suggest to include an activity that brings together project executing partners and implementing agencies to exchange lessons learned, ensuring these experiences inform future projects.

d) Thanks for contributing higher share of co-financing to PMC

Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments. Our response now follows:

b)

**Component 1:**

? **Output 1.1:**

The CEO-ER has been revised to clarify that the proposed national **EbA tool will build on and complement existing systems**, rather than duplicate them. In particular, Output 1.1 and Activities 1.1.1 (a-d) have been refined to **reflect anticipated gaps** in the existing Climate Information System (CIS), especially with regard to the integration of remotely sensed and biophysical datasets required for EbA decision-making. The revised design explicitly positions the EbA tool as a complementary layer to the CIS, enhancing its current strength in providing climate risk and vulnerability information across all 18 provinces and 130 districts, while extending its functionality to support site-specific EbA planning and implementation.

The activities under Output 1.1 have therefore been retained and sharpened to assess and identify the most appropriate technical approach for integrating additional datasets and strengthening national data management capacities. This includes drawing on lessons and proven approaches from existing systems in Lao PDR, particularly SAMIS and LaCSA, to ensure interoperability, avoid duplication, and maximise efficiency.

The revised CEO-ER also clarifies the status of the NAP process. **The NAP has not yet been formally concluded**; it is expected to be completed by 31 August 2026, with the CIS as a key output to be hosted on the NAP platform. The EbA tool will be designed and piloted in alignment with this evolving system, including incorporating findings from the national Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessments (CRVAs) developed under the NAP process. In this way, the project ensures that the EbA tool strengthens and extends existing national systems, while remaining fully aligned with ongoing national processes and institutional frameworks.

? **Output 1.2:**

References to the **NEC have been removed** from Output 1.2, and the revised text now focuses on provincial-level regulations / policies and provincial working arrangements to integrate EbA into planning and implementation. The output now emphasises mechanisms for introducing, enforcing and learning from provincial policy directives, with lessons to be fed upward through national arrangements (kindly see Output 1.2 description in Section B, Component 1).

? **Output 1.4:**

The revised CEO-ER strengthens Output 1.4 by increasing the training target to at least 152 government personnel, with **50% women**, and by providing a clearer and more robust description of the Training of Trainers (ToT) approach and its long-term institutionalisation. The Project Description overview of this Output now explicitly states 'Improved capacity of at least 152 government personnel (50% are women)', and Section B elaborates how this will be achieved through a structured and scalable training model.

*ToT model:* The ToT approach has been refined **to build directly on the ongoing NAP training programme**, ensuring continuity and sustainability. In particular, the project will adopt and upscale the ToT model implemented under the NAP process (2024-2025), which successfully trained focal points across northern, central and southern regions. This approach demonstrated

strong results, with trained participants acting as multipliers by cascading climate adaptation knowledge within their respective institutions.

To **enhance female participation**, the revised design explicitly builds on the NAP experience of engaging the **Lao Women's Union (LWU)** to identify and support female candidates for training roles. This approach will be continued and strengthened to ensure balanced participation and leadership of women in the EbA ToT programme. The project will also expand the existing pool of trained personnel, including currently trained female trainers in the three target provinces, and ensure a 50:50 gender balance in new ToT cohorts.

*Sustainability:* To ensure **long-term sustainability beyond the project duration**, the ToT programme will be **embedded within existing national and sub-national institutional structures**. Trained trainers (from line ministries, provincial departments, and technical agencies) will be formally recognised and supported to continue delivering training as part of their institutional roles. The training curriculum will also be aligned with national systems (including CRVA and EbA planning processes) so that it can be adopted and maintained by government training institutions and technical departments.

## **Component 2**

We have made a substantial restructuring of Component 2 to clarify the distinction of each output to achieve holistic implementation of EbA.

- ? Output 2.1 now focuses on **supporting conservation communities to implement integrated EbA solutions** in the target districts, while the detailed implementation logic has been separated from financing, market linkage and enterprise development functions. The revised project overview states that Output 2.1 will support **conservation communities to implement GESI-responsive integrated EbA solutions?**, and Section B now explains the sequencing from community arrangements and EbA implementation to financing, market linkage and enterprises.
- ? Output 2.2 has been revised to focus on **sustainable financing schemes leveraged for conservation communities to implement EbA solutions**, including private CSR, blended finance and REDD+ related sources, rather than remaining at the level of planning only. The revised Project Description Overview states that **at least US\$ 200,000 sustainable financing is mobilised to support the implementation of EbA for conservation households?**, and Section B explains how these financing schemes support implementation under Output 2.1.
- ? The project team has retained Output 2.3 but **substantially reframed it** so that it now serves a clearer enabling function between community EbA implementation and enterprise development. Output 2.3 now focuses on **market-linkage and value-chain assessment for agroforestry and NTFP products**, including PPP opportunities, off-take arrangements and supply-chain entry points, rather than duplicating implementation activities. This provides the analytical basis for Output 2.4 and reduces overlap across outputs. Therefore, while Output 2.3 has been retained for budgeting and design coherence, its scope has been narrowed and clarified so that it no longer duplicates implementation. It now functions as a bridging output between EbA implementation and livelihood / enterprise activation.

## **Component 3**

The revised CEO-ER now places greater emphasis on lesson capture, peer learning and dissemination, including drawing on other GEF, LDCF and non-GEF initiatives in Lao PDR. Component 3 explicitly focuses on **increased public awareness / understanding and knowledge of EbA solutions, financing and implementation through effective lessons documentation and sharing?**, and the broader project rationale also explains how the project will build on ongoing investments and share lessons nationally.

d) We appreciate the comment ? many thanks ?

5 March 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments. Our response now follows:

b) For output 1.1, text has been revised on activities 1.1.1 (a-d) in light of anticipated gaps with the existing CIS; notably its ability to embrace remotely sensed data. Its particular strength however relates to informing policy makers and sectors on the easy access to climate risk and vulnerability for all 18 Provinces and 130 Districts across the country. Importantly, the various activities associated with 1.1.1 (a-d) do still remain valid and hence are relevant to pursue as sub-tasks as they are key towards ensuring the feasibility of establishing an EbA data management system that (through this project) will be designed to consider best approaches towards uploading remotely sensed data, aligned to the findings of the recently projects NAP CRVAs that is presented within the CIS. It is emphasised that the EbA system shall be designed (and pilot tested) in a manner that acknowledges approaches and lessons learned from proven systems in operation within Laos such as SAMIS and LaCSA. Of note, the current NAP process has not yet been completed, however this shall be concluded on 31 August 2026 with a key output being the CIS which shall reside on the newly set up NAP Website ([www.naplaos.com](http://www.naplaos.com)).

For Output 1.2, your point regarding the involvement of personnel from the national setup, such as NEC, being unnecessary is noted. Reference to the NEC is now deleted and replaced with reference to Provincial level Working Groups that shall be set up to support Provincial EbA Plan implementation. Text is also added to enhance these activities under this output to set up mechanisms for introducing and enforcing the agreed regulations or policy directives within the project area at the provincial level. Efforts to learn from this will be created as specific outputs as part of the annual reporting process so that lessons learned may then be applied at the national level.

Within Output 1.4, the training of trainer (ToT) approach to be adopted is now better explained in the text. These training events shall be designed to complement and build upon the work already completed on a similar initiative that was recently completed by the ongoing NAP project. The method of seeking to improve engagement of women into the training shall be to mirror the approach adopted by the NAP Focal Points who were involved in participating in a series of ToT workshops that were undertaken in 2025. These covered three regions of Laos (northern, southern and central) between July 2024 and June 2025. Importantly, this involved, early in the process, the engagement of the Laos Women Union (LWU) who helped to identify prospective candidates for being trainers for climate adaptation across the country. More effort is now required on the delivery of EbA measures on the ground, and this project's EbA ToR programme will be designed to achieve this. It shall add expertise to a series of formally certified trainers, which already includes 6 women for Oudomxay Xieng Khuang and Phongsaly Provinces. The intention of this activity is now to upscale this ToT course, with a 50:50 split of men to women, being trained to focus on CRVA plus also the role of EbA interventions to support adaptation. Evidence from the ToT workshops (already held through the NAP process during April-May 2025) has highlighted how stakeholders from different sectors became climate adaptation trainers and these same individuals are now cascading their climate adaptation knowledge to peers within their respective sectors.

## Component 2

The team believes that Output 1.3 (Plan production) is important to get endorsed before the implementation of Component 2. Component 2 in the PIF is entitled 'Advancing EbA application and financing at the local level' and this is the implementation of Output 1.3.

The project team appreciates the comments made on Output 2.1. This now focuses specifically on implementation, including the production of a Strategic Feasibility Study (SFS) which will align with the EbA Plan (in Output 1.3) but offer more specifications to the project design. The risk of including EbA Plan production (Output 1.3) with all the implementation activities relates to programmatic delivery if issues such as land ownership, stakeholder acceptance (working alongside the village stakeholders, such as Activity 2.1.1 to agree on preferred EbA interventions at the village level) and long-term financing agreements are not reached first. For this reason, a holistic and systematic approach is being pursued, but through the separation of processes (planning separated from implementation). Text is sharpened to identify preferred EbA measures (per District). Effort has now been made to ensure this Output now delivers the biophysical and community-level EbA interventions, whilst complementing the activities defined in Output 2.2 to ensure the sustainability of both Outputs by embedding those interventions in viable, inclusive value chains and financing mechanisms. The two outputs are sequential and mutually reinforcing, not overlapping.

Under Output 2.1, the project will translate the prioritized EbA packages identified through the Provincial EbA Plans developed under Output 1.3 into fully operational implementation packages ready for on-the-ground delivery. EbA packages may include, inter alia:

'Restoration and rehabilitation of degraded forests and watersheds through native species reforestation and assisted natural regeneration;

'Climate-resilient agroforestry systems integrating perennial crops, shade trees, and soil and water conservation measures;

'Sustainable land management practices aimed at reducing soil erosion, landslide risk, and flood impacts;

'Climate-resilient agricultural practices, including improved water management, diversified cropping systems, and climate-smart irrigation;

'Fire prevention and ecosystem protection measures in climate-vulnerable landscapes.

It is confirmed that implementation under this output will directly engage at least 2,500 households, contributing to the restoration and sustainable management of approximately 5,000 hectares of climate-vulnerable landscapes. All interventions will be implemented in

compliance with national regulations and the project's environmental and social safeguards framework.

In summary, this will include the following sub-tasks:

?Activity 2.1.1: Finalization and operationalization of integrated EbA packages

?Activity 2.1.2: Technical, environmental, social, and economic screening of EbA packages

?Activity 2.1.3: Community engagement and participatory implementation planning

?Activity 2.1.4: Implementation of integrated EbA measures

?Activity 2.1.5: Capacity building for local implementation and maintenance

?Activity 2.1.6: Monitoring, adaptive management, and performance verification

With reference to Output 2.2, the project team appreciates the guidance provided and agrees that there should be a move beyond the preparation of bankable EbA plans to more directly catalyze SME growth, private sector engagement, and sustainable financing mechanisms that support long-term EbA outcomes. In response, Output 2.2 has therefore been revised and strengthened to integrate the activities previously outlined under Output 2.3. All activities related to SME development, private sector engagement, market access, capacity building, and innovative financing mechanisms have been consolidated under Output 2.2 to reduce fragmentation and strengthen the causal link between EbA implementation and sustained livelihood and resilience outcomes.

The revised Output 2.2 now focuses on identifying and prioritizing EbA-linked value chains, providing targeted business development and technical support to SMEs and producer groups, facilitating market access and partnerships, and piloting blended finance and risk-sharing mechanisms. Project resources will be allocated not only to planning, but to hands-on activation of enterprises, public-private partnerships, and investment models that generate revenue streams aligned with EbA objectives. Under this output, the project will catalyze small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), community-based enterprises, and private sector engagement to ensure the financial sustainability, maintenance, and potential scaling of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) implementation supported under Output 2.1. In line with GEF guidance, this output consolidates all activities related to enterprise development, market access, capacity building, and innovative financing mechanisms into a single, coherent framework. The emphasis is on practical, hands-on activation of EbA-linked value chains, rather than on planning or policy development alone.

With a defined focus on priority EbA-linked value chains, this improved integrated approach ensures that Output 2.2 directly supports the sustainability and potential scaling of EbA implementation under Output 2.1, contributes to measurable livelihood benefits, and mobilizes private sector co-financing in line with GEF-8 priorities. As a result, the revised structure strengthens coherence within Component 2, improves implementation readiness, and enhances the likelihood of sustained outcomes beyond the project lifetime.

This output of the project will seek to prioritize EbA-compatible value chains that demonstrate strong potential to generate income while reinforcing ecosystem restoration and climate resilience objectives. Priority value chains include, inter alia (as per Annex 23b):

?Agroforestry-based coffee systems, including shade-grown and climate-resilient coffee production;

?Bamboo-based products and processing, supporting sustainable harvesting and value addition;

?Broom grass and other non-timber forest products (NTFPs) linked to watershed restoration and slope stabilization;

?Climate-resilient agricultural systems, including shade-house and protected cultivation adapted to tropical conditions;

?Eco-tourism and nature-based services linked to restored watersheds and community-managed landscapes.

?These value chains have been selected based on their alignment with EbA objectives, market potential, and relevance to local livelihood systems in the target districts.

?Strengthening SMEs and community enterprises.

Updated Activities associated with Output 2.2 are now listed below:

Activity 2.2.1: Identification and prioritization of EbA-linked value chains and enterprises

Activity 2.2.2: Business development and capacity building for SMEs and community enterprises

Activity 2.2.3: Market access, value-chain development, and partnership facilitation

Activity 2.2.4: Piloting catalytic financing and risk-sharing mechanisms

Activity 2.2.5: Monitoring, learning, and scaling of EbA enterprise and financing models

Regarding Output 2.3, this has been enhanced further to complement the activities now set out in Output 2.2 and to better consolidate activities related to SME development, private sector engagement, market access, and innovative financing. This integration strengthens the causal link between EbA implementation and sustainable financing, reduces fragmentation, and ensures that all enabling activities directly contribute to sustained EbA outcomes. Whilst the PIF clearly states that ?During the PPG phase, a comprehensive feasibility assessment will be conducted to confirm the viability of the financing target. This assessment will evaluate the actual interest from private sector actors and secure potential engagement pathways. The assessment will also ensure that the financing figure of USD 200,000 is realistic and achievable, based on preliminary discussions with relevant private sector stakeholders.? sadly, the PPG could not secure US\$200k of guaranteed private sector commitment.

Component 3 now includes an activity to bring together project executing partners and implementing agencies to exchange lessons learned, ensuring these experiences inform future projects.

d) We appreciate the comment ? many thanks

#### 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

5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

b). Please strengthen private sector involvement in the project, as there are opportunities for their participation.

Agency Response

3 May 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments.

The revised CEO-ER has significantly strengthened private sector engagement across the project, particularly under Component 2. The project summary and Component 2 now explicitly articulate the role of **private sector enterprises, sustainable financing, market linkages, and community-based enterprise development** as integral to achieving sustained EbA outcomes. The project targets engagement of **at least six private sector enterprises** and the mobilisation of **a minimum of USD 200,000 in sustainable finance**.

Private sector participation is now clearly structured across Outputs 2.2-2.4 in a **complementary and sequential manner**. Output 2.2 focuses on **mobilising financing mechanisms** (including CSR, blended finance, and climate/environmental funds) to support conservation communities in implementing EbA interventions. Output 2.3 then identifies **market-linkage opportunities, value chains, off-take arrangements, and PPP pathways**, providing the analytical and partnership foundation for private sector engagement. Building on this, Output 2.4 supports the **establishment of community-based enterprises and formal partnerships with private sector actors**, enabling conservation communities to access markets and generate sustainable livelihoods linked to EbA activities.

This integrated approach ensures that private sector actors are engaged not only as financiers, but also as **market partners, buyers, service providers, and co-investors**, thereby strengthening the sustainability and scalability of EbA interventions beyond the project lifecycle.

5 March 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments. Our response now follows:

b) The project team appreciates the Secretariat's guidance on private sector involvement and agrees that there are significant opportunities to further strengthen their role. In response, private sector engagement has been substantially reinforced, particularly under Component 2. Output 2.2 has been revised to consolidate and expand activities related to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), community enterprises, and private sector actors, with a clear focus on moving beyond planning toward hands-on activation of EbA-linked value chains. The revised output prioritizes engagement with private companies, SMEs, producer groups, buyers, and financial institutions operating in agroforestry, non-timber forest products, climate-resilient agriculture, and eco-tourism.

Project resources will be used catalytically to support business development services, market access, and partnership facilitation, as well as to pilot blended finance and risk-sharing mechanisms (e.g. matching grants and co-financing arrangements) that lower barriers to private investment in EbA-aligned enterprises. These measures are designed to help mobilize (as the project progresses) at least USD 200,000 in private sector and co-financing contributions.

Private sector involvement is also explicitly linked to the sustainability of EbA implementation under Output 2.1, ensuring that restored and sustainably managed landscapes generate viable economic returns and incentives for long-term maintenance. This integrated approach strengthens the role of the private sector as an active partner in delivering, sustaining, and scaling EbA outcomes beyond the project lifetime.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

b. A bit more explanation of how the project will build upon previous GEF and non-GEF investments would be appreciated.

f). Please reallocate project funding after reviewing activities listed under each output to ensure the greatest possible impact.

h). While it is noted that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) describe different stakeholders? roles related to project components as well as project approach to engage stakeholders in project implementation, please segregate different project local actors and stakeholders? roles and interests and the project?s stakeholder engagement approach in the project document within the components, including in section B and the risk table.

Also, Please clarify whether FPIC has been obtain from Indigenous Peoples about project design during PPG and ensure FPIC during project implementation throughout project cycle. Additionally, consider recognizing and integrating Indigenous Peoples? self-determined priorities, indigenous governance and traditional and local knowledge into the project design and improving security of tenures of Indigenous Peoples, particularly in Component 1 and 2 (not only in Component 3). Please also consider including monitoring indicators to measure this progress in the project.

i). The project document refers to GESI-responsive but the gender-related interventions are directed at women only, not to a broader social group and genders. Please clarify what GESI-responsive means. If it is about binary considerations - women-men, please use the commonly used terms such as gender-responsive, gender-sensitive or if applicable, gender-transformative. The Gender Action Plan refers to GEDSI interventions. Again, the actions are mainly directed to women, not to the more diverse groups (if D here means diversity), nor does it include disabled groups (if D refers to Disability). Please elaborate on your definitions and adjust the terminology that is appropriate. With reference to lessons learned and knowledge generation, please consider including lessons learned and best practices in integrating gender equality and women's empowerment considerations in the project, and ensure wide dissemination for other projects to learn from.

Please ensure that reporting ? PIRs, MTR and TE, include progress in implementation of the gender-specific activities and the Gender Action Plan, highlighting lessons learned and best practices.

Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments, our response now follows:

b) Section A now includes a strengthened description of **baseline investments and complementary initiatives**, including Government, GEF and other interventions, and explains how the project will build on lessons related to watershed management, local climate finance, community engagement, climate-smart production systems and institutional coordination. Moreover, the narratives and table under ?Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other? Section also describe how the project will build on existing investments in more detail.

f) Please refer to responses previously provided.

The revised project design has sharpened the use of resources within Component 2 to strengthen implementation impact and clarify sequencing across outputs. In particular, Outcome 2 now distinguishes more clearly between: (i) conservation community arrangements and EbA implementation; (ii) financing mobilisation; (iii) market and value-chain assessment; and (iv) community enterprise development. This restructuring ensures that project resources are more directly linked to on-the-ground implementation, financing support and livelihood activation, thereby increasing impact and reducing overlap across outputs

h) Thank you for your comment. Efforts to segregate different project local actors and stakeholders, their roles and interests, plus the stakeholder engagement approach taken within the project is now improved upon within the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 8). Additionally, the revised CEO-ER now includes a fuller description of stakeholder roles in Section A (?Stakeholders Engagement?) and integrates these roles more clearly into the project rationale and implementation logic.

Pertaining FPIC, during PPG, ethnic communities were consulted and expressed support for the project. Formal FPIC documentation was not completed at PPG stage; therefore, FPIC will be applied and documented during project implementation wherever interventions may affect rights, lands, resources or traditional livelihoods, in accordance with UNDP SES and project safeguard instruments.

Meanwhile, in the revised CEO-ER document, the team has strengthened references to **ethnic communities, traditional and local knowledge, customary and village-level institutions, land / resource access, tenure screening and FPIC during implementation**, particularly in Components 1 and 2. For example, the project rationale states that local communities and ethnic groups are **?not only beneficiaries of the project but also key implementers and stewards of the landscapes targeted for EbA interventions?** (Section A), and Component 2 now incorporates traditional knowledge, local governance structures, and FPIC where applicable.

i) The terminology has been clarified in the revised CEO-ER. The project?s use of **GESI-responsive** goes beyond a women-only focus and is supported by both the Results Framework and the detailed output design. In addition to the project?s **50% women participation targets**, the Results Framework also specifies that **at least 2,500 conservation households will participate in EbA implementation, of which at least 50% are ethnic minority households**. The revised Component 2 narrative further strengthens this broader inclusion approach by explicitly incorporating **traditional and local knowledge, use of customary and village-level governance structures where appropriate, site-specific screening of land/resource access and tenure risks**, and application and documentation of **FPIC where interventions may affect the rights, lands, resources, or traditional livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and ethnic communities**. Accordingly, the use of GESI in the revised document refers to both gender equality and broader social inclusion dimensions relevant to the target landscapes.

Progress with regards to the implementation of GESI-related activities (as identified within the Gender Action Plan) will be routinely monitored by the PMU (through PIRs, the MTE and final TE).

5 March 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments, our response now follows:

b) Please refer Table 13 of the CEO endorsement that demonstrates the linkages with GEF and non-GEF related projects. More explanation of how the project will build upon previous GEF and non-GEF investments is now offered in the CEO-ER and the Prodoc.

f) Please refer to responses provided.

h) Thanks for your comment. Efforts to segregate different project local actors and stakeholders, their roles and interests, plus the stakeholder engagement approach taken within the project is now improved upon within the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 8) and within the project document for relevant components including in section B plus the risk table.

Regarding the topic of Indigenous People, the Lao Government uses the term 'ethnic people' instead of indigenous people. However, the Akha, Phounoi, Hmong and Khmu in the proposed project areas are also classified as indigenous people by UNDP's Standard 6. The ethnic villages that the PPG team visited during May 2025 onwards are located along the main roads so they understand and are fluent in speaking Lao. During project design, those ethnic people have been consulted about the activities to be proposed in the project document to ensure that they can have the right to consent to or reject the project. Participants in the village meeting supported the project and expected that they will benefit from the project interventions. A list of participants in the village-level consultation meetings has been recorded in detail within Annex 8 (SEP), and issues discussed have been recorded. Consent of the ethnic people has, however, not been documented. During project implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages, the FPIC to be applied in the ethnic villages and their consents need to be obtained and documented.

i) Many thanks for your comment. We confirm that updates to the documentation have been made, notably to update GESI in the CEO ER to state 'GEDSI' (the abbreviation of Gender Equality, Disabilities and Social Inclusion). Progress with regards to the implementation of GEDSI-related activities (as identified within the Gender Action Plan) will be routinely monitored by the PMU (through PIRs, the MTE and final TE).

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

a). Kindly outline the project execution mechanism, including the roles of subnational governments and the private sector and NGO, where applicable. Additionally, please provide details on the structure of the project steering committee and further clarify the project reporting lines.

b). We are unable to support the execution request at this time, as the project can be effectively managed by the executing agency.

## Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

Many thanks for your observations and comments. Our response is as follows:

a) The project execution mechanism has been clarified in the revised CEO-ER. A project organigram has also been included to illustrate the governance structure, including the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and reporting arrangements.

Further details on roles, responsibilities, coordination mechanisms, and reporting lines are provided under the section "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project."

b) The Agency thanks GEFSEC for this guidance. Following further review and discussions with the Implementing Partner, the project implementation arrangement has been revised to a full National Implementation Modality (NIM). Under this revised arrangement, the Department of Environment (DoE) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment (MAE) will retain full responsibility for project execution, including procurement, financial management, implementation oversight, and reporting, in accordance with national systems and UNDP procedures.

UNDP will continue to provide its standard implementation support, oversight and quality assurance functions as the GEF Agency, including fiduciary oversight, safeguards compliance, technical support, and monitoring in line with UNDP and GEF requirements. The revised governance and management arrangements in the CEO-ER and Project Document have been updated accordingly to reflect the full NIM modality, including clarification of reporting lines, institutional responsibilities, and segregation between project execution and UNDP assurance functions.

**5 March 2026**

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments, our response now follows:

a) The sub-national government will play a vital role in implementing project activities. They are the main responsible parties and will execute activities on the ground. Their roles and responsibilities are outlined in Annex 8: Stakeholder and Engagement Plan (SEP) and Section VIII of the Project Document. For example, the Provincial Agriculture and Environment Department (Division of Agriculture in each target sites) will engage under Output 2.4 by providing technical support to farms on Climate-Smart Agriculture activities, while the District Office of Agriculture and Environment will facilitate project implementation at the district level.

In addition, through the project design process, UNDP will engage with the identified NGOs during project implementation to capitalize on their hands-on experience working with communities and their thematic expertise. For example, the Comité de Coopération avec le Laos (CCL), which has been working with communities in the target areas for many years, brings strong technical knowledge in rural development, sustainable agriculture, natural resource management, and community capacity building. During the design phase, the UNDP team discussed potential collaboration with CCL, including knowledge exchange, technical assistance, and complementary activities on the ground to maximize impact. This engagement is the reason why CCL is included as one of the co-financiers of the project. The organization has been listed in Annex 8.

For the private sector, under Component 2 (Outputs 2.1 and 2.2), the project has made a deliberate effort to meaningfully engage private actors by aiming to mobilize at least USD 200,000 in private financing through innovative mechanisms such as blended finance to support conservation-focused communities. Accordingly, the Prodoc and Annex 8 (SEP) identifies several potential private sector entities, including those in the banking sector and others to be identified during the implementation phase following completion of due diligence processes. This approach ensures the sustainability of the project and maximizes the impact and leverage generated through private-sector collaboration.

For the Project Steering Committee (PSC), the project will be chaired at the Vice-Minister level of the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment. UNDP will serve as the Development Partner and supplier. The Implementation Partner for the project is the Department of Environment, which also hosts the Project Management Unit (PMU). In line with Section VIII of the Project Document, a clear firewall has been established to ensure transparency and proper separation of functions. The PMU, situated within the ministry, will work closely with the UNDP Operations Unit, while the UNDP Programme Unit will perform a Quality Assurance role and provide oversight throughout implementation.

b) The request for execution support is understood as an exceptional request in line with exception criterion 1 of the amendments for the Minimum Fiduciary Standards and Agency Fee Policies, setting clear criteria for exceptions for GEF Agencies to carry out the dual implementation and execution roles: ?i. Due to legislative or regulatory restrictions in the country, executing entities are prohibited from receiving GEF funds?. This request was made because the Government of Lao PDR and UNDP have the National Implementation Modality Standard Operating Procedures (NIM SOP), which applies to all NIM projects in the country. Under this SOP, any procurement exceeding US\$13,000 equivalent must be carried out by UNDP through Country Office Support services. This threshold was established through a formal agreement with the Ministry of Planning and Investment (now Ministry of Finance) as the Government's coordination body in September 2024. The SOP aims to reduce fiduciary risks, ensure compliance, and reinforce donor confidence in the integrity of programme delivery.

Accordingly, the UNDP Laos Country Office (CO) has received a request from the Government of Lao PDR to implement the LDCF (GEF Project ID 11695) under Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM). UNDP has been providing support to the Government, intending to eventually graduate from this SOP. As this is a mutually-agreed regulatory document with the Government, UNDP is unable to implement full NIM projects in the country at the moment.

The costs for such services will not be charged to the GEF project budget but rather will be covered by non-GEF co-financing resources as a component in the project management cost (PMC) budget, as per GEF Policy.

To ensure the strict independence required by the GEF and in accordance with the UNDP Internal Control Framework, these execution services will be delivered independently from the GEF-specific oversight and quality assurance services. A firewall will be maintained between the delivery of project oversight and execution support performed by UNDP (as requested by and agreed to by both the Implementing Partner and GEF) and will not be charged to the GEF project management costs (only if approved by GEF).

### 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)?**

**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  
5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Please review if the number on core indicator 4 and its percentage of females be increased.

Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

The revised CEO-ER increases the target for people trained / awareness raised and strengthens female participation. The Project Summary now refers to **?152 stakeholders (50% women)?** and the Project Description Overview refers to **?152 government personnel (50% are women)?** under Outcome 1.

**5 March 2026**

Many thanks for your valued comment. With reference to Core Indicator 4, it should be noted that the PIF declares Core Indicators 3, 6 and 11 only and no mention is offered for Core Indicator 4. Annex 17 (GEF Core Indicators) does declare that 100 people (30 women) will be trained or have awareness raised. This figure shall be increased to be a 50/50 representative split in Annex 17 and changed within the CEO-ER and Prodoc.

**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  
5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/17/2026: GEFSEC

The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently Moderate) must be the same as the rating under the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk (currently High), as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13. Please amend.

- c) Please provide a summary of environmental and social risks and mitigation measures in the Key risk table on page 103.

Agency Response

### 3 May 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments. Our response now follows:

b) The revised CEO-ER risk table now shows **Environment and Social: Substantial**, and the risk table includes a short summary of key environmental and social risks and mitigation measures, including screening, the ESMF, and management plans such as Livelihoods Action Plans and Indigenous Peoples Plans where applicable

c) E&S risks are added to the Key Risk table

### 5 March 2026

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments. Our response now follows:

b) The rating has been modified in the Prodoc, CEO-ER and Annexes 5 (SESP) and 9 (EMSF) so that the rating under the Environmental and Social risk category is the same as the rating under the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk, as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13

c) E&S risks are added to the Key Risk table (p103 of the Prodoc)

**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 Request

Agency Response

**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?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**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

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes. However, please clarify if ESMF and stakeholder engagement plan have been disclosed in UNDP website and provide links of the website.

Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

At the time of submission, disclosure links are not yet available, as UNDP disclosure is undertaken in accordance with the SES timeline, i.e. at least 30 days prior to PAC (i.e., during the project implementation). The project confirms that the ESMF and SEP will be disclosed in accordance with UNDP requirements and the links will be provided once disclosure is completed.

5 March 2026

We appreciate that GEF / LDCF Secretariats apply disclosure requirement consistently. UNDP's SES requirements stipulate that the project stakeholders shall have access to SES-related documentation both centrally and at the local level. However, the disclosure timeline, as per the guidance, is at least 30 days prior to PAC (after CEO ER approval).

## **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

Agency Response  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**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

Agency Response

**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

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/15/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks

1/17/2026: GEFSEC

Please remove the cofinancing from UNICEF and CCL as their letter of support does not indicate any confirmed cofinancing contributions towards the project.

Agency Response

**3 May 2026**

Many thanks for your guidance.

UNICEF has now provided an updated co-financing letter confirming the co-financing amount, and the CEO-ER therefore retains UNICEF co-financing on that basis.

With regard to CCL, UNDP Laos has been in communication with the organisation to secure a formal co-financing confirmation letter. However, as the internal review and approval process is expected to require additional time, the project team has, at this stage, removed the proposed CCL co-financing commitment from the co-financing table in order to ensure that all reflected co-financing is fully confirmed and documented at CEO endorsement stage.

The project nevertheless expects to maintain technical coordination and collaboration with CCL during implementation, particularly in areas related to community engagement, sustainable livelihoods and agroforestry-related activities. Should the formal co-financing letter be finalised during implementation, the contribution will be reflected and reported through the appropriate project reporting mechanisms.

5 March 2026

Many thanks for your comment. We can confirm UNICEF updated the cofinancing letter with agreed co-financing values clearly stated, We also received positive feedback on this from CCL, and the letter is currently being signed.

**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

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**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?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**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

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 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

•5/18/2026: GEFSEC

The TOR for the National Project Associate, even the tasks listed as 'technical', are administrative tasks, which don't justify the charge to project components. Please revise the budget or the TOR accordingly.

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

This will be reviewed upon adjusting the project component, and provide specific feedback. In the meantime, following are the general comments

- Please refer to the updated [Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy](#) prepared for the 70<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting. We kindly request the agency to provide a line for the subtotal of each expenditure category in the budget.

- Please include the *international* and *local consultants* in the category 'Contractual services-Individual'?

- Please relabel the 'Equipment' category for 'Goods'?

- Costs for positions should be categorized as 'Salary and benefits / staff costs'.

- We noticed that an international technical specialist is being charged in addition to a National Project Coordinator to the components and the PMC. The TORs for all personnel should be provided in the Prodoc, they are missing in Annex 16, please see attached.

- For some expenses, in the 'Description' column we don't understand the percentages that have been provided. If you take the example of the National Gender and Stakeholder Specialist: it says '25% of \$2,438/month'. Nevertheless \$2438x48 (months)= \$117,024. what is the 25% referring to? Each position must be presented in one single budget line - otherwise, we can't assess the reasonability of the personnel assigned to this project. Same applies to all other budget lines (i. e. equipment).

## Agency Response

**20 May 2026**

Thank you for your comment. The Annex 7 has been revised accordingly to justify the charges to project technical components.

**5 March 2026**

Many thanks for your valued observations and comments, our response now follows:

? The subtotal line of each expenditure category has been added

? International and local consultants have been included in the Contractual services-Individual category

? UNDP does not have 'Goods' category; therefore, the 'Equipment' is used to ensure the eligibility and validity of expenditures reported from the UNDP side

? For project staff, UNDP reports these costs under Contractual Services - Individual. The Salary and Benefits/Staff Costs category is used only for UNDP staff personnel who are not directly funded by the project budget

? ToRs are presented for all positions presented in Annex 7 except for those linked to MTR and TE inputs which are standard templates which shall be adopted at the time (but not

be included in Annex 7). Please note that Annex 16 relates to the ToR for the Project Board (not the international/national consultants to be procured through the project).

? We apologize for the confusion. Although each position was presented under a single budget line, the detailed descriptions were taken directly from the budget notes of the ProDoc. As some positions were budgeted across multiple outputs, percentages were used to reflect the distribution of the budget. We have now revised the detailed descriptions in this budget table for ease of reference.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 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 Request

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/13/2026: GEFSEC

Please address the comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/13/2026</b>	<b>3/11/2026</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/15/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/18/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		