

GAIA Technical Assistance Facility ??

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12099
Countries
Global
Project Name
GAIA Technical Assistance Facility ??
Agencies
WWF-US
Date received by PM
10/8/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Jason Spensley
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

CEO Approval Request

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

October 23, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 23, 2025:

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 results?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 23, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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 appropriately funded?

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

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 10, 2025:

Cleared

October 23, 2025:

A) The project demonstrates strong integration with a dedicated blended finance vehicle, addresses genuine market gaps in technical assistance for SIDS/LDCs, and incorporates both investment readiness and knowledge management components. The theory of change is well-articulated with clear causal pathways linking technical assistance inputs to enhanced bankability and ultimately to increased adaptation finance flows. The results framework includes appropriate indicators.

B) Please consider how it can be possible to provide technical assistance in the form of studies and capacity building to a larger number of projects at a lower dollar value each provided directly by the GEF funds. For example, please consider if the GEF funds can be mixed with other sources so GEF is provided a much smaller amount of GEF funds per projects, across many more projects.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

To expand the influence of GEF TA funding for projects, we will blend GEF TA grant with FinDev TA co-financing for all SIDS and LDC adaptation projects where the GEF grant will contribute at least 60% and other donor up to 40%. With this blending, we expect to help establish and enhance up to 19 policies, studies, assessments, and impact management and monitoring systems for GAIA investees (emerging market public institutions), enhancing their ability to attract and manage climate adaptation finance from the GAIA Fund. The TAF will train at least 1,280 individuals and may help to unlock up to USD 60m in follow-on investments from the GAIA Fund, with potentially additional project-level co-financing from other investors. The unlocked financing could help institutions implement activities that improve the resiliency of agri-food value chains, enable greater access to more reliable water resources, boost ecosystem health and services, increase adoption of adaptive measures for built environments, and expand resilient energy and transportation infrastructure

We have updated the CEO ER document to reflect this change, including Project Summary section (page 3), the Impact Indicator spreadsheet, and the results framework to reflect this change.

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

October 23, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

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 thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?
- 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 are 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 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 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

December 10, 2025:

Cleared

October 23, 2025:

- A) The theory of change is well-articulated with clear causal pathways linking technical assistance inputs to enhanced bankability and ultimately to increased adaptation finance flows. No revision required.
- B) Climate Adaptation Rationale: Please clarify the methodology (approach, criteria) that will be applied to establish the connection between project interventions and documented climate hazards and impacts in target countries.
- C) Please develop and document explicit bankability criteria that GAIA TAF will use to assess investment readiness. These criteria should be transparently shared with potential investees and used to guide technical assistance prioritization.
- D) Systems Analysis: Please strengthen the systems analysis to explicitly map how GAIA TAF interventions will interact with other technical assistance facilities, national climate planning processes (NAPs), and existing institutional capacity initiatives.
- E) Please note that the M&E budget total in this section (first image = \$71,887) is not aligned with the M&E budget in the Budget Table (second image = \$51,887). Please revise, as it seems like the Budget Table total amount for M&E is summed incorrectly.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) 			
M&E	Technical Assistance	SCCF-A	35,943.50
M&E	Technical Assistance	LDCF	35,943.50

Total Salary and benefits / Staff costs			\$32,375	\$51,887
Grand Total				

Agency Response
WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

(B) - As noted in Section B. Project Description, Overview and Theory of Change of the CEO ER document, the GAIA TA Facility will manage the project selection and sub-granting process by leveraging the project screening effort first done by the GAIA Fund. All projects are first reviewed by the GAIA Fund, which has a thorough set of screening and due diligence requirement to establish a project's climate adaptation benefits, including its proposed interventions and documented hazards. The screening and due diligence requirements are described in the uploaded GAIA Fund's Operations Manual, which can be found uploaded in the roadmap section.

After the GAIA Fund determines the climate adaptation rationale of a project and sees the need for further technical assistance to address specific gaps in project documentation (e.g., project-specific gender assessments and action plan), the project will be shared with the GAIA TA Facility for review and support. As such, given the nature of the project selection process, all of the TA Facility projects are already pre-screened to demonstrate clear climate rationale.

(C) - As noted in Section B. Project Description, Overview and Theory of Change of the CEO ER document, the GAIA TA Facility will manage the project selection and sub-granting process by leveraging the project screening effort first done by the GAIA Fund. All projects are first reviewed by the GAIA Fund, which has its set of bankability criteria for all projects, including the required commercial and technical documentations. The uploaded GAIA Fund's Operations Manual includes detailed list of bankability criteria, and Appendix 1 of the Operations Manual includes the requirement checklist that is shared with all potential investees. This is already leveraged to guide technical assistance prioritization, along with practical implications around the potential monetary costs, strength of implementing partner, and estimated time required to complete the technical assistance work.

(D) - We have noted this feedback and clarified the Systems Analysis. Please see newly added sub-section Systems Analysis within Section B. Project Description of the CEO ER document, which details the GAIA TAF's linkages with other TA Facilities, national climate planning processes, and other existing initiatives.

(E) - We have updated the Budget table in Annex G. The correct amount is \$71,887.

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

Dec 10, 2025:

Cleared

Nov 6, 2025:

A) Please clarify the role of WWF and GEF Secretariat on the Project Steering Committee.

B) Please check the formatting of this section before resubmitting, as it appears the same text is repeated. The formatting is also challenging, with one long section of unbroken text without paragraphs or bullets. The following section has various font sizes, margin settings and indents. Please ensure the submitted document is ready for public posting on the GEF website.

C) The CVs of executing agency staff are noted. Please provide TORs for the PMU staff positions listed in the Budget Table: TA Facility Manager ? administrative support personnel; TA Facility Manager ? M&E personnel; TA Facility Manager ? Knowledge management personnel.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

A) We propose that the GEF Secretariat appoint one voting representative for the GAIA TA Committee, which serves as this project's Steering Committee. We have updated this language within the subsection of the GAIA TAF Governance Overview within the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects section of the CEO ER document

B) The Agency has checked the formatting in the portal and it looks ok, but please note that the portal does not provide the ability to format text easily, or to preview how the final document will look. We can work with GEF IT if it still does not look right, let us know.

C) We have updated the TOR description of the PMU staff in a separately uploaded annexure document, located in the roadmap section.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

February 4, 2026:

Cleared

January 12, 2026:

All CCA indicators figured have still not be inputted. Please do so, at an ambitious level.

(a) Again, please include a target level for CCA core indicator 1 on number of beneficiaries, for both LDCF and SCCF. These are currently indicated as 0.

(b) CCA core indicator 5 on number of private sector companies engaged is still at 0 for SCCF. Please indicate an imbitious figure.

(c) The number of plans is still very low for core indicator 3 for both LDCF and SCCF. We assume that for every TA provided to every private sector company engaged there will be a plan. Please consider increasing accordingly.

(d) Just to be sure, please note this project is to be funded by LDCF and SCCF, and therefore the CCA indicator framework for CCA must be used, rather than that for the GEF Trust Fund. For example, we are not sure what the reference is to core indicator 11, as the CCA indicator framework has 5 core indicators.

Dec 16, 2025:

Please increase impact target ambition. For example,

(i) For core indicator 3 on number of policies/plans/frameworks/institutions to strengthen climate adaptation, please indicate at least one institution receiving TA and one TA plan for each institution;

(ii) For core indicator 4 on number of people trained, 60 people seems extremely low.

(iii) Please consider more holistically how many TAs will be provided by the TA facility, and how many people will be involved in each TA.

(iv) For beneficiaries, please provide a target level, at least considering all people trained.

October 23, 2025.

No. Please provide ambitious indicator targets for all core indicators, including number of beneficiaries and hectares, as well as people trained, policies/plans/strategies, and private sector entities engaged.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (1/29/2026):

Thank you for the comment.

Please note that CCA indicators 1, 3, 4, and 5 have been populated. Indicator 2 is not applicable as the TA Facility does not have on the ground activities that can be quantified and summarized by landmass or coastal areas.

(a) Targets for Indicator 1 - number of direct beneficiaries - have been added to the CER (core indicators section) as well as the results framework, and the core indicator worksheet. To differentiate from indicator 4, the figure reflects the number people (i.e. the total number of clients, suppliers, and/or co-workers) experiencing the impact of improvements in institutional capacity based on interacting with employees who received GAIA TAF training (as defined by SCCF LDCF indicator 4 below). The target is forecasted by applying an amplification factor of 2 on the estimated number of people trained or with awareness raised (indicator 4, see definition and methodology below). The amplification factor is conservative, and based on a high likelihood of trained employees and partners in local ecosystems interacting and leveraging gained knowledge with at least two clients, suppliers, and/or co-workers. The GAIA TAF team (PMU) will refine this multiplier and validate it through the initial year of project support and training. New content is marked with GREEN highlights in the CER, Results Framework, and Indicator Excel.

(b) Thank you for this guidance. This error is noted and has been corrected in the portal so that targets for this indicator (as well as all other indicators) are attributed to both the LDCF and SCCF, with each source accounting for half of the overall target for each indicator.

(c) Thank you for the comment. The technical team believes that the target of 25 for indicator 3 regarding policies, plans, frameworks, and institutions supported by this grant is reasonable. Calculation of this total is prudent and realistically reflects the depth of TA needs by SIDS and LDC countries. Based on conservative estimates, with real-life data provided by CFM, FinDev Canada, and Catalytic Finance, which are three market-leading TA and development program providers, an average of \$147k will be needed in per unit TA costs. After accounting for the knowledge management, PMC, and MEL components, the remaining \$1.2m of this GEF grant for TA delivery equates to about \$48k for each of the 25 plans, policies, frameworks, and institutions that the GAIA TAF is planning to support. The level of ambition on indicator 3 has been increased as far as possible by matching funds from FinDev Canada's grants, but there are insufficient resources at this time to realistically further increase the expected value for this indicator.

(d) Thank you for the comment. References to GEF TF core indicator 11 have been struck from the CER and RF. The core indicator section in the CER and the results framework for this project are both updated so that they only use the SCCF/LDCF/CCA indicator framework.

WWF-GEF Agency Response (1/8/2026):

Thank you for the comment.

(i) Indicator 3.6 - number of institutions with increased capacity to attract and manage climate adaptation finance (i.e., through GAIA Fund investment) has been added. The target for this indicator is 6 institutions, based on the following assumptions: total expected pipeline (years 1-3) of 100 projects, 30% requiring TA, 25% SIDS/LDCs, and 80% adaptation (note: assuming a higher allocation toward adaptation than GAIA's 70% mandate, given that adaptation projects are more likely to require TA support). This brings the total target for indicator 3 to 25. This update is reflected in the CER document (Core Indicator section) and the core indicator worksheet. New content is marked with BLUE highlights.

(ii) The current target for indicator 4.1 in the second submission CER and impact indicator sheet is 1280, not 60.

(iii) The target is estimated by including an estimated 380 people supported through the project TA process, accounting for an estimate of 20 people from each government office attending the relevant meetings and workshops from the number of institutions/policy/assessments supported. It also includes an estimated 900 people trained, 300 each year, from annual knowledge dissemination channels (webinar and report downloads).

(iv) A target for Core Indicator 11 is now included in the CEO Endorsement Request (see core indicator table). Core Indicator 11 has also been included alongside SCCF sub-indicator 4 under Objective Indicator 3 (Number of beneficiaries who received training from the GAIA TA Facility) -- on page 1 of the project Results Framework. The target -- 1280 beneficiaries -- is inclusive of an estimated 900 people trained and 380 people supported through the TA process. With regards to indirect beneficiaries, the TA Facility will also support the overall impact of the GAIA Fund, which is expected to reach a total of 3.41 million beneficiaries in SIDS and LDCs, of which 1.12 million are direct and 2.26 million are indirect. (This is based on 70% of total GAIA portfolio allocation toward adaptation, and out of that 25% for SIDS and LDCs).

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 screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 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 N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 23, 2025:

Pending review by OP.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Dec 10, 2025:

Cleared

Nov 6, 2025:

1. Please ensure the Gender Action plan is uploaded.
2. Under the knowledge management component, please ensure that lessons learned on empowering women and on gender mainstreaming, are produced and widely disseminated to ensure scaling up and replication.
3. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-specific results, including on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan are included in reporting (PIRs, MTR, TE).
4. Please strengthen the reflection of gender indicators in the Results Framework. This will ensure better monitoring of gender-specific results.







Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

1. The GAIA TA Facility Gender Action Plan is uploaded. It is viewable and downloadable from our end in the ESS document upload section in the portal. Please let us know if you are still unable to view, as we can reach out GEF IT try to rectify the issue.

ANNEX F: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SCREEN AND RATING

Attach agency safeguard screening/assessment report(s), including ratings of risk types and overall project/program risk classification as well as any management plans or measures to address identified risks and impacts

Title	Module	Submitted	Actions
250924 GAIA TAF GAP vFinalDraft	CEO Endorsement ESS		
250924 GAIA TA Stakeholder Engagement Plan vFinalDraft	CEO Endorsement ESS		
Cat Memo GAIA_Adaptation_Challenge_09-24-2025	CEO Endorsement ESS		

2. We have enhanced the language in the Description of Component 2 - Knowledge Management and Sharing of Lessons from Supported Projects within Section B. Project Description section of the CEO ER (page 17) to ensure that lessons learned on women empowerment and gender mainstreaming will be produced and disseminated widely as part of the Component's outputs and activities.

3. We have updated the Monitoring and Evaluation sub-section within Section B. Project Description section of the CEO ER to ensure that the M&E activities include the gender-specific results noted within the GAIA TAF's Gender Action Plan. We also noted that the GAIA TAF's Results Management Framework has integrated progress against GAP as a key indicator to track as part of the Lead Executing Agency, Catalytic Foundation's responsibilities.

4. We have nested the Gender Action Plan indicators within the GAIA TAF's Results Management Framework through reference of progress against GAIA TAF's GAP.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Dec 10, 2025:

Cleared

October 23, 2025:

Please ensure the stakeholder engagement plan is uploaded.

The project states it will take a participatory approach to involve the necessary local stakeholders, including communities and vulnerable populations, national and sub-national governments, and local financial institutions. However, the project submission lacks information (including in the

annexed SEP) on the role of local stakeholders and communities and beneficiaries. Please ask agency to elaborate on any plans to ensure inclusion and to engage and consult these local stakeholders in project implementation







Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

The GAIA TAF's Stakeholder Engagement Plan is uploaded. It is viewable and downloadable from our end in the ESS document upload section in the portal. Please let us know if you are still unable to view, as we can reach out GEF IT try to rectify the issue.

ANNEX F: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SCREEN AND RATING

Attach agency safeguard screening/assessment report(s), including ratings of risk types and overall project/program risk classification as well as any management plans or measures to address identified risks and impacts

Title	Module	Submitted	Actions
250924 GAIA TAF GAP vFinalDraft	CEO Endorsement ESS		
250924 GAIA TA Stakeholder Engagement Plan vFinalDraft	CEO Endorsement ESS		
Cat Memo GAIA_Adaptation_Challenge_09-24-2025	CEO Endorsement ESS		

As the GAIA TAF is TA Facility tied to the GAIA Fund, which is a blended finance fund investing in sub-sovereign, quasi-sovereign, and sovereign climate projects in emerging markets, the GAIA TAF will support the capacity building of these governmental entities to ensure their investment readiness to receive GAIA investments and potentially other forms of external financing from other private investors.

As such, the key stakeholder groups for the GAIA TAF are: (1) the GAIA Fund Partners to ensure the efficiency and relevancy of the TA Facility to directly help create investment outcomes; (2) GAIA TA Facility Execution Leads; (3) NGO Network of Project Preparation Facilities to ensure complementarities with other market TA services and serve as potential TA delivery partners on the ground; and (4) emerging market government institutions who would be the GAIA Fund investees to ensure their needs are addressed by the TAF.

The GAIA TAF's SEP includes details on the participatory approach we took to develop the facility and plans to ensure continued engagement with local stakeholders.

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 STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 23, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?
b) 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 RequestThis project is not seeking PPG.

Agency Response
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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

Dec 10, 2025:

Cleared

October 23, 2025:

Please significantly increase the total amount and number of sources of estimated co-finance, considering the scale of this blended finance investment, and the influential set of partners involved. For example, please consider how investment catalyzed co-finance from MuFG and GCF can be considered, as well as other categories of co-finance from Pollination and Climate Finance Partners.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

At this time, we're not able to provide additional co-financing letters. The GCF, MUFG, and FinDev Canada investment in the GAIA Fund were already committed before the GEF TA grant approval. CFM, Catalytic, and Pollination are all compensated by the Fund so there's no in-kind contribution we could include.

Nevertheless, we recognize that capital commitment and deployment are equally important in the actually getting investments flowing into SIDS and LDCs. As such, we have further emphasized the importance of the GEF proceeds in catalyzing actual capital deployment into adaptation projects in these markets. In addition to the direct co-financing provided by FinDev Canada as the other initial donor capitalizing the GAIA TA Facility, the GAIA TA Facility expects to help indirectly deploy \$64.75 million of committed senior equity from the GAIA Fund into climate adaptation projects in SIDS and LDCs. Given that the GAIA Fund's capital was already committed by the limited partners with the support of the GCF, providing de-risking junior tranche equity before the finalization of this TA Facility, the amount is not being counted as direct co-financing. Nevertheless, we highlight the critical, catalytic impact of the GEF TA Facility that would be crucial to the deployment of GAIA Funds into projects on the ground.

We have included this text under the Co-Financing Table in Annex A (page 35).

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) 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

October 23, 2025:

This is a global project contributing to a global TA facility alongside a global investment facility with potential impact at a global scale, of a capacity building nature.

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

October 23, 2025:

This is a global project contributing to a global TA facility alongside a global investment facility with potential impact at a global scale, of a capacity building nature.

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

October 23, 2025:

This is a global project contributing to a global TA facility alongside a global investment facility with potential impact at a global scale, of a capacity building nature.

Agency Response

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 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 the budget (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

February 2, 2026:

Comments cleared by PM, pending any further comment from OP.

Jan 12, 2026:

Comments are remaining on impact indicator ambition.

December 10, 2025:

Please note new comments above on indicator ambition.

October 23, 2025:

A) Please provide ambitious indicator targets for relevant core indicators, including number of beneficiaries and hectares, as well as people trained, policies/plans/strategies, and private sector entities engaged.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (1/28/2026):

Thank you for the comment.

(i) Indicator 3.6 - number of institutions with increased capacity to attract and manage climate adaptation finance (i.e., through GAIA Fund investment) has been added. The target for this indicator is 6 institutions, based on the following assumptions: total expected pipeline (years 1-3) of 100 projects, 30% requiring TA, 25% SIDS/LDCs, and 80% adaptation (note: assuming a higher allocation toward adaptation than GAIA's 70% mandate, given that adaptation projects are more likely to require TA support). This brings the total target for indicator 3 to 25. This update is reflected in the CER document (Core Indicator section) and the core indicator worksheet. New content is marked with BLUE highlights.

(ii) The current target for indicator 4.1 in the second submission CER and impact indicator sheet is 1280, not 60. This can be found in the core indicator table in the CER document.

(iii) The target is estimated by including an estimated 380 people supported through the project TA process, accounting for an estimate of 20 people from each government office attending the relevant meetings and workshops from the number of institutions/policy/assessments supported. It also includes an estimated 900 people trained, 300 each year, from annual knowledge dissemination channels (webinar and report downloads).

(iv) A target for Core Indicator 11 is now included in the CEO Endorsement Request (see core indicator table). Core Indicator 11 has also been included alongside SCCF sub-indicator 4 under Objective Indicator 3 (Number of beneficiaries who received training from the GAIA TA Facility) -- on page 1 of the project Results Framework. The target -- 1280 beneficiaries -- is inclusive of an estimated 900 people trained and 380 people supported through the TA process. With regards to indirect beneficiaries, the TA Facility will also support the overall impact of the GAIA Fund, which is expected to reach a total of 3.41 million beneficiaries in SIDS and LDCs, of which 1.12 million are direct and 2.26 million are indirect. (This is based on 70% of total GAIA portfolio allocation toward adaptation, and out of that 25% for SIDS and LDCs).

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

We have updated the indicator targets.

As a TA, this project does not include on the ground implementation scope so we don't have the number of hectares and direct beneficiaries (Indicators 1 and 2). We also can't include these numbers because of these are indicators for which the GAIA Fund will be reporting to the GCF for its funded project and we need to avoid double counting.

We have updated the Indicator 3. Number of policies/plans/frameworks/institutions to strengthen climate adaptation to 19 from 2, based on the assumption that the GEF will contribute 60% of the funds towards SIDS/LDC adaptation projects with rest coming from other donors.

We have updated the Indicator 4. Number of people trained or with awareness raised to be 1,280 from 60. This includes an estimated 380 people supported through the project TA process, accounting for an estimate of 20 people from each government office attending the relevant meetings and workshops from the number of institutions/policy/assessment supported.

It also includes an estimated 900 people trained, 300 each year, from an annual knowledge dissemination channels (webinar and report downloads).

We have updated Indicator 5. Number of private enterprises engaged to 19, expecting about one private enterprise engaged to support the delivery of TA activities for developing the policies/plans/frameworks. We increased the Sub-indicator 5.3 Total financial value of lines of credit and/or investment funds to be \$60m, with an estimated 6 total funded projects from the TA facility receiving an average investment of \$10m.

These changes are reflected in the Impact Indicator Excel, the Results Framework, and the CEO ER Document's SCCF/LDCF Core Indicator Table (Page 26), Project Summary (Page 3), and Benefit subsection of Section D. Policy Requirements (Page 33).

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 2, 2026:

Cleared

Jan 12, 2026:

Please insert this information into the GEF CER project document.

December 10, 2025:

A location is required for each project. For global capacity building oriented projects, a location where a global learning activity may take place, for example alongside a COP is required.

1. October 23, 2025:
2. Please provide the capital of cities in case of capacity building or knowledge development. ??

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (1/29/2026):

We apologize for this oversight in the document. It is now adequately reflected.

WWF-GEF Agency Response (1/8/2026):

CER Annex E has been updated to include the following geographic coordinates for the project.

46.204391, 6.143158

Geneva, Switzerland - This is the headquarters of Catalytic Finance, the Lead Executing Agency and Manager of the TA Facility. The location of global learning activities will be distributed as learnings are shared publicly across multiple public forums, including webinars, conferences, and regional learning platforms.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 23, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 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

Addressed

Nov 6, 2025:

Please note the comment above on the budget aspects of component 1.

B) Please note that using the decimal place is not necessary and seems to have thrown off total amounts in Annex G (e.g., PMC of \$137,239 in the Project Description Overview table, but \$137,240 in the Budget Table). Please review to ensure consistency across all sections of the CEO Approval documentation.

Agency Response

WWF-GEF Agency Response (12/5/2025):

B) Thank you for this comment. These figures have now been rectified in the budget to consistently reflect the correct amounts.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection 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 N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Feb 4, 2026:

Yes, pending further comment from OP.

Jan 12:

Limited comments still remaining.

Dec 10, 2025:

Limited comments remaining to be addressed, primarily on impact ambition.

October 23, 2025:

Comments need to be addressed.

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

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/23/2025	12/5/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2025	1/8/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/10/2025	2/3/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/12/2026	2/4/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/2/2026	