

# Evaluation of Natural Capital to Support Land Use Planning, Improved management effectiveness of Terrestrial Protected Areas, deployment of SLM practices and Creation of Eco-Villages in Central Madagascar

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10389

**Countries**

Madagascar

**Project Name**

Evaluation of Natural Capital to Support Land Use Planning, Improved management effectiveness of Terrestrial Protected Areas, deployment of SLM practices and Creation of Eco-Villages in Central Madagascar

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/3/2021

**Review completed by PM**

5/5/2022

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 14, 2022**

The project is developed under the BD1.3 (mainstreaming), BD2.7 (Protected area), and LD1.4 (Integrated landscape).

Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project description summary**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The result framework is coherent with the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

- We do not understand how the in-kind cofinancing from "National Parks" can be considered as "investment mobilized". These resources correspond to the planned expenditure for the management of protected areas. Please, correct or clarify.

- There is no letter of cofinancing from the Ministry of Environment & Sustainable Development (MEDD). Please, correct or modify.

Agency Response  
**May 4, 2022**

The co-financing from GRETA is made through the Rhyvi?re 2 project that is financed by the EU, the FFEM and the private sector with the aim of producing renewable energy to reduce dependency on firewood and enhance opportunities for improving the productive potential of the rural communities. The project also entails efforts at the protection of watersheds and forests in the biodiversity-rich headwater regions, forest restoration, erosion control etc.

The co-funding offered by the CI was drawn from the project entitled ?sustainable landscape for the eastern regions of Madagascar?, financed by the GCF fund. The goal of the project is to improve the resilience of climate-vulnerable smallholder farming families, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation, and leverage private sector climate investments. The activities financed through the CI is the improvement of the resilience of agricultural families, through the popularization of sustainable agricultural practices, such as conservation agriculture, agroforestry, the use of drip irrigation techniques, etc.

? We agree that the co-financing can be considered as ?investment mobilized?

? The full amount of GRET co-financing has been secured and will be available for disbursement until 2026. The activities of GRET and IUCN is provided in the description above

Role of GRETA: Given its extensive engagement with the communities in the Central Highlands, and project area, GRETA is expected to be directly involved with the GEF 7 project to facilitate the development of co-management plans and regulations for transfer to ecovillages, in particular to (i) oversee the planning, implementation and monitoring of the co-management arrangements for the ecovillages within the COFAV, (ii) mobilization and organization of communities, establishing ? ecovillage governance structures, negotiation of co-management between village and COFAV management authority, (iii) training communities in planning and implementation of co-management arrangements and (iv) support in planning investments for COFAV ecovillages and providing technical support and training for implementation of ecovillage investments

? Information regarding GRETA activities and relation to GEF project is maintained as ?Grant? and ?Investment Mobilized? and a description of activities related to GEF project as ?notes? below the Co-financing Table (pages 4 and 5 in GEF CEO ER).

#### **April 6, 2022**

(i) The 3 co-financing entries from the recipient country government are based on in-kind contributions in terms of staff time, office space and use of existing vehicles at national, regional and municipal levels to support the GEF project and complementary activities as defined in Table 17 of UNEP Project Document. Given the current economic situation in the country that has been further affected by the Covid situation, MEDD (IP) has no resources to directly support the PMU. Refer to Co-financing Table in GEF CEO ER and Table 17 of UNEP Project Document.

(ii) and (iii) GRET and IUCN co-financing are in the form of funds (non-GEF) that these two organizations have been able to solicit for activities that are complementary to the GEF Ecovillage project and thus will remain as ?Grants?. The GEF guidelines define in-kind as follows: Contributions in the form of goods and services other than money, including but not limited to salaries and wages, office space and utilities. It also says that investment mobilized excludes recurrent expenditure. Given that GRETA and CI's

contribution is in the form of cash from its donors that they will invest on actual activities on the ground, we believe these funds are therefore not in-kind, but rather actual money (or investment) that is mobilized. Refer to Co-financing Table in GEF CEO ER and Table 17 of UNEP Project Document. (iii) CI changed to Donor Agency (pages 4-5).

(iv) The brief summary of the nature of co-financing is provided under Co-financing Table in the GEF CEO ER. It is already there in Table 17 of UNEP project Document.  
(iv) Refer to notes under the Co-financing table in GEF CEO ER (pages 4-5).

- Apologies for the mistake made on the portal. The CEO ER rightly pointed out that this is indeed recurrent expenditure, and this has been corrected on the portal.

- Thank you for pointing this out. The letter showed blank in the pdf merging during submission. We have updated Appendix 11 so that it shows properly at the end.

#### GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

- We may need further information about the definition, the methods, and tools used in terms of Natural Capital Accounting. It seems that the budgets under the component 1 and 2 seem relatively low in view of using, training, and mainstreaming NCA approaches. Please, clarify.

#### Agency Response

Many thanks for your comments. During project preparation, consultations with local actors and future project beneficiaries resulted in an agreement that the NCA will focus on biodiversity, water resources, soil and carbon. The assessment methods would likely include both biophysical and economic assessments relevant to this project. In terms of the biophysical assessment, the Natural Capital Ecosystem Account method is a methodology that makes it possible to integrate and synthesize in an accounting, multicriteria and geo-localized manner a set of physical and socio-economic data. Another potential method is the ARIES Model (Artificial Intelligence For Ecosystem

Services) which makes it possible to map and quantify ecosystem services at the scale of a territory, to identify their beneficiaries, and to manage the factors that influence the production of these services according to needs and priorities. The ARIES model has been applied in Madagascar before to assess ecosystem services where the accounts used are carbon sequestration, water supply and sediment regulation. Thus, within the framework of the ecovillage project, the model could be used for the evaluation of the ecosystem water account. Other possible methods could be the Market Price Methods and the Contingent Valuation Method.

In the two intervention Regions of the ecovillage project, environmental problems refer mostly to the degradation of biodiversity, watersheds and water resources. They are commonly caused by bush fires, logging, tavy practices around natural forests in the forest corridor and around Protected areas, which have also worsened with climate change. These pressures have been identified at the municipality level, according to the first diagnoses made during the preparation for the implementation of the target new Protected Area COFAV. At the same time, the municipalities represent potential for reconciling development and conservation, thanks to the enhancement of natural resources, such as the development of agriculture on tany or tourism among others, with the potential to create sources of income aimed at reducing pressures and dependence on unsustainable management of natural resources.

The expected impacts of ecovillages on natural capital would be as follows:

Biodiversity will be conserved; water resources and watersheds will be preserved; land degradation will be mitigated and carbon sequestration maximized.

In line with these points, we have increased the budget for component 1 by \$50,000 to deliver training on natural capital and for component 2 by \$20,000 to support further the integration of natural capital into 9 municipal LUPs (into Output 2.1) based on the results from the natural capital assessment of ecosystem services provided by COFAV and target watersheds. Please refer to the yellow highlights in the revised Appendix 1 to the ProDoc.

#### **Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

#### **Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 14, 2022**

The proposed targets are aligned with those fixed at PIF level. The adjustments are minor.

#### Agency Response

**April 6, 2022**

The Itermo PA that was part of the PIF proposal was excluded from the project at PPG stage on the recommendation of the Project Technical Committee due to the resurgence of insecurity since 2020. The Ambatofinandrahana district where the Itermo PA is located is classified as a "Red" Zone. The GEFCEO ER and UNEP Project Document does not include Itermo PA within Core Indicator 1.2. The correction has been made in the portal.

#### Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the alternative scenario is aligned with what was agreed at PIF level.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

Some questions remain on the value of proposed targets:

- Indicator 4.1: is it enough to consider nine municipal plans and one district plan to target 238,234 ha under the indicator 4.1 (management of terrestrial landscapes out of protected areas to benefit biodiversity)?

- Indicator 4.3: Are there enough resources (training, investments, support) to claim 119,353 ha of terrestrial landscapes under SLM?

- Indicator 1.2: the transfer of management of COFAV and the establishment of management plans are one aspect, but please detail the activities and interventions to improve the management of 53,092 ha of protected areas.



## Agency Response

Thank you for your comments. Agreed.

- Indicator 4.1: The pilot LUP at the district level is targeted at Ambositra District in the Amoron?I Mania Region. The Ambositra District has 23 municipalities, only 7 of the municipalities are where project ecovillages are located. The aim of the work in these locations is to demonstrate the economic costs and benefits, and associated trade-offs in terms of natural, social and human capital at that level on the basis of the NCA work. It is critical however to also inform the design or land use planning policies beyond the municipality level, in particular at the larger district level (as a pilot) so that it could also demonstrate the value of natural capital and the impact of policies designed to preserve it. This will ensure that approaches to sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation can be applied to inform land use planning and policy, initially at the district level, and later at the Regional level, and across the country more broadly. Thus Core Indicator 4.1 covers the following:

- ? 1 LUP at Ambositra District level (covering 23 municipalities, including municipalities within and outside the project interventions)
- ? LUPs at 7 Municipal Levels in Amoron?I Mania Region
- ? LUPs at 2 Municipal Levels in Haute Matsiatra Region

The total area covered by the above points is 357,687 ha, but to avoid double counting, the area under Core Indicator 4.3 (Area under SLM of 119,353 hectares) was excluded giving a total of 238,234 ha for Core Indicator 4.1.

- Indicator 4.3: The budget for achieving 119,353 ha of SLM will come from both GEF and non-GEF sources (including National and regional Governments and other entities such as NGOs operating in the project area). In any case we agree with the comment and have increased the budget for SLM activities by \$250,000 (refer to yellow highlights in the revised budget, Appendix 1 to the ProDoc).

- Indicator 1.2: The key activities for improving management of 53,092 ha of COFAV (Indicator 1.2) are listed in the Table 10 under Output 3.3. E.g.:

- ? SMART community patrols to protect and conserve integrity of PA
- ? Improving community knowledge on biodiversity (including *Mantella cowanii*)
- ? Community involvement in participatory monitoring of COFAV
- ? Community forest protection against fires, over-exploitation and clearing through co-management approaches through MOUs
- ? Restoration of critical fragmented patches through protection, supported assisted natural regeneration
- ? Alternative economic activities to reduce pressure for shifting cultivation, over-harvest of forest products
- ? Improved livelihood practices
- ? Livestock grazing management
- ? Strengthened communication and collaboration between communities and PA authorities
- ? SLM and agroecological practices outside COFAV to improve community incomes and reduce pressure on PA resources
- ? Promotion of energy-efficient cooking stoves to reduce demand for firewood
- ? Promotion of ecotourism

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 3rd, 2022

Addressed.

**February 15, 2022**

We take note of that the text has been completed in the portal, but we found at least 15 typos in this section. To be corrected, please.

**Sustainability.** *Environmental sustainability* issues related to the Ecovillage model and the implementation of the Ecovillage Strategy are addressed directly by a number of project activities, in particular: (i) ecovillage management plans that **will** provide a strategy and the action plan of the ecovillage to protect its environment, including global environment impacts; (ii) local agreements with village communities that are negotiated, with management rules for the ecovillage and PAs adjacent to ecovillages; and (iii) a **participatory** monitoring framework that will monitor trends in important biodiversity and natural resource use. The project will test sustainable agricultural, grazing and land management practices, as well as livelihood and small-scale enterprise development in each ecovillage in order to reduce human pressure on the COFAV, forests, and watershed areas so as to protect biodiversity and **essential** ecosystem services. Sustainable agricultural intensification and integration will also contribute to better management of available land. Suitable energy efficient and renewable energy options will be tested, along with tree **plantation** and agroforestry to reduce the impacts on forests. In **terms** of *Financial sustainability*, the intent of the project is to demonstrate that the ecovillage model can produce tangible benefits for communities while maintaining the flow of environmental services from the ecosystems on which they depend. The results and impacts on local communities of sustainable economic activities carried out on their productive lands, including the PA and watersheds will provide the incentives to create new businesses and enterprises, increase demand for public and private services **training**, **extension** and technical support and promote the establishment of innovative agricultural practices. Additionally, the project will seek to promote new financial instruments such as carbon credit, ecotourism, solidarity investment and placement systems and establishment of microfinance systems. These financial opportunities can strengthen local financial institutions including micro-lending and credit institutions and provide investment security and financial services needed for sustained investments to the ecovillages. The **energy** efficiency and renewable energy technologies can potentially help to seek carbon credit opportunities to generate substantial economic resources for ecovillages at a national or regional scale later on, since the pilots **may** be too small to directly benefit from carbon credits. *Socio-cultural sustainability* will be enhanced by the creation and **strengthening** of collective community programs (e.g. ecovillage and PA co-management) to provide the community a larger voice and platform for social change, enhance their roles and influence in local level planning and financial transfers and policy matters. The engagement of local level trainers from within the community in the implementation of ecovillage activities will strengthen their role as guardians and stewards of the ecovillage environment. The **separation** of the co-management development plans for the COFAV and ecovillage management (and municipal land use plans) through a participatory, inclusive and transparent and its later implementation through participation of all community members will strengthen ownership. The design of sustainable resource use and livelihood activities will be designed in consultation with local communities based on their needs and priorities, rather than be imposed from outside, thus creating an environment that would be conducive to the local social and cultural context of the communities involved. The project will invest in training and capacity building in order to implement participatory sustainable resource management and conservation management arrangements involving all stakeholders. The effects of such training and capacity building will be felt across the communities involved, as well as those outside the pilot ecovillages so as to extend the benefits more widely across the

Central Highlands, thus helping in uptake. Support for participatory processes, improved self-governance and more efficient planning and decision making and gender sensitiveness can encourage a more profound impact across a wider region, beyond the project areas. *Institutional sustainability* will be promoted by enhancing the capacity of MEDD, other key government agencies (particularly agencies related to water, agriculture, livestock, planning and economy) to integrate NCA in future policy, planning and programs in the country. The process of creation of ecovillages will further facilitate the decentralization of decision-making to the regional, local and community levels in the quest for achieving global benefits.

**January 14, 2022**

The project is innovative as it aims to operationalize the concept of natural capital and ecosystem-based community approaches at the landscape level. Sustainability issues are related to the Ecovillage model, the local agreements, and participatory monitoring.

- Please, complete the text in the portal about the project potential for scaling up.

Agency Response

**February 15, 2022**

Many thanks for your comment. The text has been corrected across the files and on the portal entry.

Thank you and apologies for the oversight. The text has been completed on the portal.

**Project Map and Coordinates**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

Geographic coordinates of pilot communes are available. Further details will be welcome at PIR stage when the project interventions will take place.

4-12-20

Cleared

10-30-19

Please include the location of the EcoVillages in the map.

Agency Response

April 6, 2022

The project map is now attached as Annex D on the portal and as Annex H to GEF CEO ER.

Refer to Annex H of GEF CEO ER.

07-02-2022

Agreed. A map plus related table are now included in the ProDoc and in CEO ER section *1b. Project Map and Geo-Coordinates* to show the 18 project fokotany (ecovillages) and the neighborhood sub-villages that are part of the ecovillages.

09-04-2020

Map included as required

**Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

Partially.

- We understand that the enterprise "Naturally" is a cofinancing partner and will be involved in the project implementation.

- However, at CEO endorsement, we would have expected more details about the concrete involvement of local producers, companies, and organizations. The level of commitment from the private sector seem very hypothetical. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. Section 4 of the CEO ER has been revised (refer to yellow highlights) to provide further details about the involvement of local producers, companies and organizations in project implementation.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

There is also a particular attention to the COVID-19 related risks.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 3rd, 2022**

Addressed.

**February 15, 2022**

- Based on your clarification, the project can still be defined as a National Implementation Mode, with the Ministry of Environment (MEDD) as main executing partner and a Project Steering Committee, chaired by the MEDD, and involving most of key-partners (various ministries, decentralized authorities, private sector, NGO...).

- However, we did not find the letter you are referring to. Please, provide the letter from the government asking for the assistance of UNEP ESE Unit. The letter should highlight the list of activities that UNEP ESE unit will execute, with their amounts.

- Please, revise the "Institutional framework and implementation arrangements" (text and diagram) to reflect the role of UNEP ESE Unit that is not included.

**January 14, 2022**

- The project is considered implemented by UNEP and executed by the Ministry. Please, confirm.

- However, it seems that several activities will be implemented by UNEP ESE (budget lines for consultants: 1202 \$30,000, 1202 \$50,000, 1203 \$20,000: 2203 contract of \$70,000 or \$80,000 - it seems there is mistake in the total, see excel budget). These contracts seem an exception to the National Implementation Mode. These arrangements should be requested, listed, and budgeted in a letter signed by the GEF OFP. UNEP should show an effort to find alternative solutions (national consultant, third partner, etc) and make the demonstration that using UNEP experts will be cost-efficient.

- On the same line, it is written in the M&E section that UNEP experts will be involved on gender issues.

### Agency Response February 15, 2022

-Noted.

-Thank you for your comment and apology for the oversight on the letter from the government. Please find attached. As you can see the letter was signed already on February 3rd and notes the total amount budgeted for the relevant outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 2.1. The budget in Annex E on the portal breaks down the amounts per budget line related to those outputs and clearly indicates which of the activities will be executed with the technical support of UNEP ESE Unit, i.e. budget lines 1201, 1202, 1203, 2202 and 2203.

- We have included the role of the ESE Unit to the "Institutional framework and implementation arrangements" in line with that of the other technical partners such as ANAE and GRET (text and diagram).

### January 14, 2022

Thank you for your comments. The total has been corrected.

- We confirm that the project is implemented by UNEP and executed by the MEDD.
- UNEP Role: and cost-effectiveness: The GEF OFP has provided a letter where he confirms the need for technical expertise from UNEP ESE Unit in particular for training and technical support for the NCA work and its application for the development of LUP. This is premised on the expertise and experience of the UNEP ESE Unit, for example through the Natural Capital Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (NCAVES) project. The Unit counts with a wide network of partner organizations and experts and as such is accustomed to delivery of project objectives with constrained financial resources in a cost effective manner. ESE Unit prioritizes working with local partners and Ministries to build local capacity and thereby ensure that minimal deployment of international experts has maximum impact in terms of local implementation. This has also been expressed as a high priority of the MEDD and is so reflected in the project documents. In addition, the ESE Unit as part of its mandate to promote the use of NCA will only charge actual cost for staff time (and travel) for provision of technical support, with no additional institutional overhead or management costs, making it a cost efficient arrangement for the MEDD.

- M&E: there seems to be confusion as we could not find that reference. In any case, please note that no use of UNEP experts for gender work is envisaged. Support for gender-related technical aspects and training will be provided locally through existing agencies, NGOs and consultants.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 14, 2022**

Yes, the project is aligned with the NBSAP (2015-2025) and the Voluntary LDN targets, in addition to sector plans (forests, environment...).

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
Yes there is a KM approach anchored into the project and especially the component 4.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
Yes.

Agency Response



## Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

See the chapter 9 on Monitoring & Evaluation: We have several questions about the M&E table and budget:

- Could you confirm that the baseline data for the monitoring programme will be available at CEO endorsement, or at least at inception workshop?
- What is the use of a \$120,000 budget for monitoring visits and the ESMP? (\$40,000 are already planned for the EISA and the ESMP).
- There is also a budget of \$90,000 of the measurement of project indicators. Please, clarify the use of this budget.
- Please, clarify the footnote mentioning the surveys related to turtle, seagrass, and mangroves.

## Agency Response

Thank you for your comments. Refer to ProDoc Appendix 1, revised GEF budget.

- We confirm that that the baseline data for the monitoring program will be available by the project inception/launch workshop.

- The budget has been reduced as follows: (a) travel related to monitoring of results framework and GEF core indicators at \$50,000 (including METT) and (b) travel related to other safeguard aspects such as GAP, ESMP, SIP and GRM at \$50,000. Monitoring will be done on a bi-annual basis that will also include (in addition to PMU staff) representatives of key public sector institutions, NGOs operating in the project area and community representatives to ensure that M&E is done in a transparent manner. The additional \$40,000 under Budget Line 1213 is planned to recruit a national consultant to develop the ESMP that would require assessment at the field level and consultation with local communities and stakeholders.

- The monitoring of GEF Core Indicators will entail the participation of soil and water quality laboratories so as to be able to validate the results relating to SLM targets.
- Apologies for the confusion. There was a mistake in the M&E Table in the project document that is now corrected to reflect the amount in the budget table (in Annex 1)
- Footnote: apologies for the oversight. The reference to seagrass etc. has been removed.

## **Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

## **Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 14, 2022**

Addressed.

**March 3rd, 2022**

- Please, note that the purchase of vehicles is not eligible under pmc. Please correct. ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF\\_Guidelines\\_Project\\_Program\\_Cycle\\_Policy\\_20200731.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf)).

**February 15, 2022**

We understand that vehicles are provided by executing partners and cofinancing partners, but these vehicles are old. No new vehicle can be bought by the cofinancing (it would have been the preferred option). We understand the reasoning and the rationale about the vehicles (1 car + 2 motorcycles) and agreed on the request.

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

**Annex C: Budget**

- The budget table under the annex C is out of the margins. Please, adjust the table to be fully readable in the portal.

- Vehicle: Please describe the current vehicle fleet of the main executing partner (Ministry) and eventually the cofinancing partners.

- See if some of these partners cannot cover the budget for the purchase and the maintenance of the requested 4x4 vehicle and the two motorbikes. It would be the preferred option. If not possible, we will consider the use of GEF resources.

- The number of consultants (both international and national) seem relatively high. We wonder if this is the best strategy in a COVID-19 situation. We also wonder the sustainability of the approach. We would prefer the use of local, national, or international entities present in the country (universities, research center, training center, farmer organizations...). Please, clarify.

- Budget line 1209: \$60,000 for documentation of lessons and best practices? Please, clarify the nature of the work and justify this amount.

- Budget 4201: \$150,000 of publications seem high. Please, justify.

- Budget 5303 Sundry: \$20,000 is not acceptable. Please, modify.

- Budget line 1300 administrative support, \$30,000: please, clarify and justify this budget line.

- Budget line 1600: \$140,000 of travel on official business: please, clarify and justify this budget line. This budget line comes in addition to the budget line 1602 (\$40,000) and 1603 (\$40,000) both for travel expenses of the PMU. These budgets do not seem justified and reasonable. Please, correct.

- There are several lines related to computers, offices, publications, communication... We wonder the need for the budget line 5200 (\$20,000) for reporting. Please, justify.

- Please, clarify if additional budget lines are planned for UNEP interventions (in addition to the use of fees for supervision) especially related to the M&E, gender issues, ESIA and EMSP.

Agency Response

**May 4, 2022**

**Project Budget**

The reference point (a), we have revised the TORs for the PC to reflect direct involvement with technical activities (see Appendix 9 TORs of key staff in attached Combined Appendices Document)

As we had previously mentioned, the \$10.2 million represented as 'grants' reflects investments that have been mobilized by GRETA, CI and other non-government entities for specific technical investments that are complementary to the GEF 7 project. GRETA and IUCN have their own project management activities that are financed with the funds that they have been able to mobilize. These 'grant' funds are already negotiated with their financiers for agreed investments and management costs associated with their individual activities and therefore are not 'fungible' for covering the cost of specialists under the GEF 7 project

The PMC co-financing is largely in kind and made up of salaries of staff, use of existing transport, office equipment and furniture and use of existing government facilities for project-related support as follows:

MEDD (including 2 regional DREDD offices and Municipal level support) ? ?

Salaries of full-time regional coordinators (2), and proportionate salaries of Project Director, communication and administrative/management staff involved with the project at national level, regional level (2 regions) and municipal levels. In addition, proportionate cost of use of MEDD and DREDD, office equipment and furniture, use of existing facilities for project related work at national, regional and municipal levels - Approximate equivalent of USD 230,000/year

? MAEP (including 2 regional DRAE offices and Municipal level support) -

Proportionate cost related to salaries of administrative/management staff involved with the project at national level, regional level (2 regions) and municipal levels. In addition, proportionate cost of use of existing office equipment and furniture, use of existing facilities for project related work at national, regional and municipal levels - Approximate equivalent of USD 45,000/year

? MNP ? Costs of management and administration staff of MNP in COFAM that will be directly working with MEDD to support implementation of the project activities in COFAM, including proportionate costs of use of existing MNP COFAM communication, facilities and equipment for supporting COFAM - Approximate equivalent costs of USD \$55,000/year

? FAPBM ? Costs of management/administration staff support for potential financing of ecovillages within COFAV as means to reduce the pressure of PA resources - Approximate equivalent of USD 10,000/year

GRETA has its own management team for its project that consists of a Chief of Project and other staff responsible for overseeing aspects related to the environment, electro-mechanic, ? construction, socio-economic aspects and field animators at around USD 100,000/year.

We have already agreed that there is a substantial contribution by the government entities and given the current financial crunch exacerbated by the Covid 19 situation, the MEDD has no direct additional grant resources to support PMC costs. However, efforts will be made during project implementation to increase co-financing.

April 6, 2022

## Project Budget

(a) The Government (MEDD-IP) is already financing the position of Project Director and two Field (local) Coordinators in the Project Sites (estimated around USD 200,000), and given the current economic situation in the country that has been further affected by the Covid situation, we do not expect MEDD (IP) to provide additional cash resources to support the PMU. As mentioned, MEDD is seconding a staff member to serve as Project Director for the project who will be responsible for the overall administration of the project. However, given the very technical nature of the project and the need to ensure inter-linkages between the NCA work, land use planning and actual implementation on the ground in 18 ecovillages (comprising 39 villages sub-units) in 9 municipalities within 2 regions, MEDD feels that it is very important to recruit a Project Coordinator (who will largely serve a technical function) to coordinate the technical aspects of the project. The Project Coordinator will provide 66% time for technical aspects and 34% time related to support the Project Director (MEDD senior staff) in the management and administration of the technical activities. Clear terms of reference for the PC is provided describing the unique responsibilities for technical outputs of the project. Refer to Appendix 9 of UNEP Project Document.

(b) Administrative support is now excluded from the PMC budget. Refer Appendix 1 (Budget) of UNEP Project Document.

## Agency Response (March 8, 2022)

The cost of vehicles is now excluded from PMC and included under Components 2 and 3 (see Appendix 1)

Thank you for your comments.

- Vehicles: This is a critical need, given that the project sites are remote and rugged, with little or no public transportation. The motorcycles are to be used by the two field coordinators for their interactions with the ecovillages, provide oversight and mobilize and facilitate community engagement. In addition, a 4-wheel vehicle is necessary to facilitate access of the PMU staff, extension and resource persons for the mapping, planning, training, technical oversight and monitoring at the COFAV and ecovillage levels.

- In terms of the existing vehicle fleet with the MEDD, the acquisition of vehicles in possession of MEDD dates back to 2006. Currently, less than 40% of these vehicles are in working order, but they will not be able to perform missions in the rugged terrain and remote areas of the project because of their dilapidated state. The state of the roads that serve the ecovillage sites are secondary tracks that are difficult to access except by 4-wheel drive vehicles in good condition, equipped with well-functioning dog clutches. The situation in terms of vehicles with co-financing partners is also similar to that of the MEDD. Thus, to ensure the smooth running of this project, it is desirable that it is the GEF fund the purchase of the 4-wheel drive vehicle and the two motorcycles.

- Consultants: To ensure the optimization of the use of the funds allocated by the GEF in this project, the MEDD opted for the choice of the ESE Unit of UNEP to ensure a comprehensive package of external technical advice and expertise that cannot be provided by local competence as confirmed during project preparation. This external

intervention is clearly targeted to the NCA component and it informing the LUP. The Unit will therefore provide technical advice to the MEDD to ensure the skills necessary to constitute a package for successful delivery of the project. All other work will be undertaken through national consultants, training institutions, research institutes and NGOs that are operating within Madagascar, and more specifically within the project area, to the extent possible.

- Documentation of lessons budget 1209: This budget line will support the planned scaling up of the lessons and best practices of the project, which begins first at the level of the neighbouring municipalities of the 9 target municipalities of the project, and which extends to the regional scale, and finally national level. There will be a capitalization/documentation of lessons and good practices of the project, the development of guidance documents and training materials that will serve for supporting training on these good practices for replication to other municipalities and regions in the country. Additionally, this activity will serve to help develop policy/practice notes related to NCA assessment and integration with LUP development, co-management of PAs, promotion of the ecovillage concept, etc., that can serve as tools in support of scaling up and replication. There will also be workshops at different levels for the sharing of these good practices.

- Budget line 4201 for Publications- This budget line has been reduced to \$ 80,000 with the intent that it would help dissemination of technical tools (brochures, manual, documentary film, etc.) as well as tools to guarantee the visibility of the project and its achievements. Various types of communication support will be developed periodically to target different categories of target audience. In short, this budget line will ensure the implementation of the communication plan that will be developed at the start of the project implementation.

- Budget Line 5303 Miscellaneous: This amount has been removed.

- Budget line 1300 administrative support: This amount is intended to cover the costs of the two implementing partners at the Region level to cover their administrative costs related to oversight functions.

- Budget Line 1600 Travel: The budget overall under 1600 has been reduced from \$220,000 to \$140,000 and differentiates between travel for M&E and travel related to provide oversight for LUPs (Component 2) and ecovillages (Component 3).

- Budget Line 5200 This amount has been removed.

- Additional Budget for UNEP Interventions: No additional budget is foreseen for UNEP use related to M&E gender, ESIA and PMSC. The only UNEP project support is envisaged for the technical/training support for NCA assessment and LUP as explained earlier and in the letter from the GEF OFP.

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**February 15, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 14, 2022**

No

The GEF Secretariat made comments at PIF level to be responded at CEO endorsement. We would like to see a table with responses. These responses should especially justify the changes with the PIF on the following points:

- Confirm the targets;
- Confirm cofinancing;
- Confirm elements for sustainability;
- Propose a comprehensive risk analysis with mitigation measures.
- Develop the role of the private sector.
- Develop a Gender Action Plan.
- Synthetize lessons from past and on-going projects on Ecovillages (Senegal, Guinea).
- Reinforce the reasoning related to the LDN policy in Madagascar (LDN targets, priority areas, protection/SLM/restoration).

#### Agency Response

- **Targets:** The targets are now confirmed following field consultations and at the Validation workshops. Core Indicator targets are provided in Annex A of the CEO ER.
- **Co-financing:** Co-financing is confirmed at \$27,476,346 and supported by co-financing letters in Appendix 11 of the ProDoc.
- **Sustainability:** Financial, Environmental, Socio-cultural and Institutional sustainability is now elaborated. Refer to Appendices 17 to 21 of the ProDoc.
- **Risk Analysis:** A thorough risk assessment was undertaken during the PPG stage and risk and management responses are discussed in detail in respective sections of the ProDoc and the CEO ER.
- **Role of Private Sector:** This is discussed and is also reflected in response to the question on the private sector in the early part of this review sheet.
- **Gender Action Plan:** A detailed gender assessment was undertaken during the PPG stage and a gender action plan was developed as per Appendix 19 of the ProDoc.

- Synthesize lessons from the past: The lessons from other ecovillage projects were taken into consideration in the preparation of this project and are reflected in Section 3.1 of UNEP ProDoc.

- NDT targets: This is addressed in particular means by which the project will help towards these targets (Refer to Section 4 of GEF CEO ER in yellow highlights).

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 14, 2022**

Comments from France and Germany have been addressed.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**??April 6, 2022**



This is now updated.

(i) The international travel was meant for the International PPG Team Leader (it is normal practice to recruit an international Team Leader for PPG stage). However the international PPG Team Leader was unable to travel to Madagascar due to the Covid situation and this amount is consequently excluded from the updated PPG utilization table.

(ii) Miscellaneous category is also excluded

Refer Annex C of GEF CEO ER

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**May 4, 2022**

The responses are available in the Part I, "item 4" (Cofinancing) and "Annex" and are acceptable. We recommend the technical clearance for Council consultation.

**April 12, 2022**

1. Core Indicators: addressed

2. Co-financing: Please provide more info about these 2 grant as the co-financing letters doesn't provide enough info

- GRET (CSO) ? 8.352M grant

- CI - \$143,477 grant

• Will this amount will be provided ?in cash? to the GEF project? If so, ?grant / investment mobilized? are the appropriate categories.

•

• The grant amount received by GRET from a few different sources is quite high, but no clear information about the activities. Has the full amount already been secured and will be available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation? Will the grant activities implemented by GRET be utilized for the GEF project (component 3)? What is the role of GRET in the GEF project?

•

• If GRET has not secured the grant yet, this co-financing can be removed at this stage, and once secured, this can be reported as materialized co-financing during implementation stage.

• If GRET has already secured the grant, the grant will be available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation, and will ensure the grant activities be integral part of the GEF activities, it can be reported as ?other / investment mobilized?. Please provide info about the activities and relation to the GEF project in the Investment Mobilized description.

•

3. Project Map: addressed.

4. PPG report: addressed

5. Budget: points (b) and (c) addressed - point (a) not addressed: still the Project Coordinator is charged across the project's components - the Agency says in

the Review Sheet that *“The Project Coordinator will provide 66% time for technical aspects and 34% time related to support the Project Director (MEDD senior staff) in the management and administration of the technical activities”*.

Though evidently a Project Coordinator needs to have some involvement in technical activities, when reading the TORs one sees that the activities are mainly related with coordination (including the management of technical activities). For instance, see the summarized version of the so called *“Technical Functions”* below (see pages 31-32 of the attached TORs):

- *Manage overall project technical support across all components ?*
- *Overall responsible for coordination and delivery of the technical assistance ?*
- *Guide and oversee the policy scenario analysis (in coordination with the international consultant team, research institutes and MEDD ?*
- *Support and guide the multidisciplinary analysis of the 9 municipalities (coordinating with local administration) ?*
- *Oversee and guide the investments in COFAV ?*
- *In relation to the 18 ecovillages, be responsible for ensuring that the situation analysis is complete ?*
- *Oversee and guide the creation of the governance structures ?*
- *Be responsible for selection of demonstration sites within the ecovillages (this perhaps is one of the fewest pure technical activities, but as a Project Coordinator, it is reasonable to have it)*
- *Oversee the design and full execution and implementation of the communication plan and KM activities*
- *Ensure knowledge management products and communication of technical issues, innovations, and learnings among key officials of the MEDD ?*
- *Convene stakeholder fora to promote the NCA work*
- *Oversee the development and execution a monitoring and evaluation system (M&E) and facilitate the mid-term and terminal reviews*
- *Be responsible for monitoring of technical progress, identify measures for course correction and adjustment guiding the M&E process*
- *Manage and monitor the project risks ? including social and environmental risks ? including those initially identified in the ProDoc and submit new risks to the Project Board for consideration and decision on possible actions if required; update the status of these risks by maintaining the project risks log.*
- *Monitor implementation plans including the gender action plan, stakeholder engagement plan, and any environmental and social management plans;*
- *Monitor and track progress against the GEF Core indicators.*
- *Support the Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation process*

Now see the summary of the so called *“Project Management Functions”*

- *Supervise and coordinate the production of project outputs ?*

- *Support* the PD in his/her responsibilities ?
- *Help the PD prepare* annual Project Implementation Reviews ?
- *Supervise and coordinate* the work of all technical staff, consultants and sub-contractors ?
- *Support* the PD in developing the annual work plans ?
- *Liaise with* UNEP, the PSC, relevant government agencies ?
- *Support* the PD in the preparation of the ?

Given the above, and considering that as mentioned in the first set of comments the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.7 Million, of which 10.2 million is represented in grants, please ask the Agency to cover this position with the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

#### **April 7, 2022**

Responses to the control quality have been provided (in pink) within the review. The request for vehicles (1 car and 2 motos) follows the GEF guidelines and is approved.

#### **March 21, 2022**

The control quality highlighted the following items to correct/respond/justify:

1. Core Indicators: One protected area WDPA ID (Itremo PA) remains blank under Core Indicator 1.2. Please add it, as this is mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage.

2. Co-financing:

(i) Recipient country government (3 entries): can any portion of their co-financing be considered as ?Public investment? and ?Investment mobilized?? The project document lists several source of co-financing which will be channeled through ministries to support the GEF project. This can be reported as ?Pubic investment/investment mobilized?.

(ii) GRET \$8,352,000 grant: Will this organization provide this amount using their own budget? Will it be in cash? Or will they contribute non-GEF funding that they received? If the latter, report it as ?In-kind / recurrent expenditures?.

(iii) Conservation International:

- Change ?Civil society organization? to ?Donor Agency?
- Change ?Grant / Investment mobilized? to ?In-kind / recurrent expenditures?

(iv) Investment mobilized description section: provide brief summary of each investment mobilized.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment & Sustainable Development (MEDD)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEF)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	8,127,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Madagascar National Parks (MNP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,346,440.00
Civil Society Organization	GRET - Professionals for Fair Development	Grant	Investment mobilized	8,352,000.00
Private Sector	Foundation for Biodiversity and Protected Areas of Madagascar (FAPBM)	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,841,429.00
Civil Society Organization	Association Nationale d'Actions Environnementales (ANAE)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	126,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Conservation International	Grant	Investment mobilized	143,477.00
Civil Society Organization	Societe Naturalliah	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	40,000.00
<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>				<b>27,476,346.00</b>

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

The cofinancing secured represents US\$17,139,440 of recurrent expenditures (62%) and US\$10,336,906 of the investment mobilized (38%). Investment mobilized represents parallel investments and allocations from the entities indicated in the table above. 110% value of cofinance anticipated at the Concept (PIF) stage has been realized.

3. The project map is missing under the annex D (it is available elsewhere, but not under this item): please, include it.

**ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates**

**Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.**

The Project Map and Coordinates are included under Part 2: Project Justification - Section 1.b.

4. On Status of Utilization of PPG

(i) Please explain why International travel would be required in a National project.

(ii) Unspecified miscellaneous expenses are not allowed for project implementation ? please explain what miscellaneous expenses entails.

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the financing status in the table below:**

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF Amount (US\$)</i>	
	<i>Budgeted amount</i>	<i>Amount spent to date</i>
International Consultants plus fee charges	35,350	31,850
Local Consultants	36,000	30,583
Domestic Travel	7,000	8,396
International Travel	5,000	0
Workshops and Meetings	11,650	15,304
Miscellaneous Expenses	5,000	4,200
Bank charges	0	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>90,341</b>

5. Budget table:

a. Project Coordinator is being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds ? *which for this projects is not the case*), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.7 Million, of which 10.2 million is represented in grants.

**ANNEX E: Project Budget Table**

Please attach a project budget table.

**ANNEX E-1 - RECONCILIATION BETWEEN GEF ACTIVITY BASED BUDGET AND UNEP BUDGET LINE (GEF FUNDS ONLY US\$)**

Project title: Evaluation of Natural Capital to Support Land Use Planning, Improved management effectiveness of Terrestrial protected Areas, deployment of SLM practices  
 Project number: GEF ID  
 Project executin: Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)  
 Project implementation period:

To:	2022	Expenditure by project component/activity (provide description)						*Insert actual year					Total	
		Add additional components/activities as required						Add additional years as required						
		Comp. 1	Comp. 2	Comp. 3	Com 4	PMC	M&E	budget	2022	2023	2024	2025		2026
UNEP Budget Line	2027													
10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT														
1100 Project personnel														
1101 Project National Coordinator		10,000	16,000	16,000	5,000	24,250		71,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	71,250
1102 Financial Assistant						56,250		56,250	11,250	11,250	11,250	11,250	11,250	56,250
1103 Field/Regional Coordinators (Co-financing)								-						-
1104 Communication and M&E manager (Co-financing)								-						-
1199 Sub-total		10,000	16,000	16,000	5,000	80,500		127,500	25,500	25,500	25,500	25,500	25,500	127,500

b. Admin support is not an eligible expenditure ? if needed, it has to be covered by co-financing resources. Please ask the Agency to remove it.

1299	Sub-total	170,000	105,000	66,000	118,000	-	40,000	499,000	128,000	100,000	101,000	70,000	20,000	499,000
1300	Administrative Support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1301	Administrative Support	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	30,000
1400	Club total	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	30,000

### March 14, 2022

All the points are addressed. The project is recommended for clearance and Council consultation.

### March 3rd, 2022

Please correct the point on the budget. Upon receipt of a revised project package, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement and Council consultation, as requested by Germany.

### February 15, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the two pending points (item II/7 and Coordination/Institutional arrangements).

### January 14, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	1/14/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	2/15/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/3/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/14/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

CEO Recommendation

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**