

# Recovering tiger population and landscape through the sustainable land use and ecosystem restoration

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

<b>GEF ID</b>	11163
<b>Countries</b>	Thailand
<b>Project Name</b>	Recovering tiger population and landscape through the sustainable land use and ecosystem restoration
<b>Agencies</b>	IUCN
<b>Date received by PM</b>	2/5/2025
<b>Review completed by PM</b>	5/29/2025
<b>Program Manager</b>	Ulrich Apel
<b>Focal Area</b>	Multi Focal Area
<b>Project Type</b>	FSP

## CEO

### Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

1) Please enter GEF Agency Project ID, if known/available.

2) Some part of the GEF funding amount does not exactly match with the amount indicate in the OFP Letter of Endorsement. Please correct so that they match with the amount indicate in the OFP Letter of Endorsement. Please consult the GEF portal team in case it is the GEF portal system restrictions.

GEF Project Grant: (a) 4,375,994.00	Agency Fee(s) Grant: (b) 393,839.00
PPG Amount: (c) 150,000.00	PPG Agency Fee(s): (d) 13,499.00
Total GEF Financing: (a+b+c+d) 4933332	Total Co-financing 54,518,603.22

3) Please remove the indication of Mixed & Others in the Project Sector section. It is for projects aligned with CCM focal area only. The proposed project is not aligned with CCM focal area.

Project Sector (CCM Only)
Mixed & Others

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1.Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this section of the budget was added during the PIF/project concept stage by World Bank and cannot be edited by us at this point. The budgets we are referring to are those related to PPG agency fee and PPG grant amount which we do not have access to editing.

2.Thank you very much for this feedback. We apologise for the earlier discrepancy this is now adjusted.

3. Thank you for the comment. As advised, we have removed the indication of Mixed & Others in the project sector section.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

Biodiversity as Principal Objective (2) is agreeable.

The agency may consider either:

- include the relevant Core Indicator 3, relevant to the project's activities on restoration, in line with the proposed alignment of Rio Marker to Land Degradation, or,
- drop Land Degradation as Significant Objective (1) to none, since the project activities, nor the GEF Core Indicators are aligned with Land Degradation.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

As advised, we have removed reference Land Degradation as Significant Objective from the portal as well as the CER word version since as correctly identified, project activities are aligned with Land Degradation while GEF Core Indicators are not aligned. The land degradation allocation will contribute to the interventions focused on sustainable land management as opposed to restoration.

**2. Project Summary.**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

a) It not concise. Please summarize more concisely.

b) No, the project summary is too long. Please shorten and capture the main elements. Please keep the reference to the GEF-8 Wildlife Conservation for Development IP.

c) Yes.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a and b. Thank you very much for your feedback. As advised, we have shortened the project summary to capture the main elements and also changed the reference to GEF-8 Wildlife Conservation for Development IP. This is included in the online CER template as well as the clean and track changes word version versions of the uploaded CER.

**3. Project Description Overview**

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 26, 2025 /VC Apr 9, 2025)

- a) Yes, however, please refrain from using the acronyms in the Objective statement.
- b) Yes
- c) Yes
- d) Yes for KM and M&E. Gender dimension is not clearly budgeted. Please improve on that aspect. Please ensure that lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment are included in knowledge and communications products and are widely disseminated. Please ensure that under M&E, gender-related results and lessons learned, including on the implementation of the gender action plan, are regularly monitored and reported on.
- e) Yes, both roughly at 5%.
- f) Yes, roughly at 5%.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a. As advised we have spelt out the acronym. We apologise for using an acronym in the objective statement in the first instance.

d. Kindly note that gender equality is mainstreamed across all components. Thank you for your advice for the implementation phase of ensuring lessons learned and best practices as well as monitoring and reporting on gender related results.

#### 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

(NN Mar 31, 2025)

a)

1) Please improve this section overall, including improving the flow of the narrative. Please include more specific facts e.g. demography (rather than a blanket statement such as 'different ethnic groups' - please be more specific) and natural resources referred to (e.g., 'cash crops' is very generic, please specify what specific crop is relevant in the project area), and analysis of root causes and barriers. For instance, "Raising of free-roaming livestock inside the forest" sounds like a threat, rather than root cause causing it.

2) It is unclear where/what the section 3 is (page 11 in pdf version of CER document). Please clarify in the document.

into 19 Forest Complexes based on the ecosystem approach. Two of these forest complexes - WEFCOM and DPKYFC are identified as priorities in the Thailand Tiger Action Plan 2022-2034. In the case of WEFCOM the expansion of tiger numbers in the Thung Yai Naresuan-Huai Kha Khaeng World Heritage Site (TYNHKKWHS) over the last two decades has been rigorously studied, and their movement into PAs of sWEFCOM (as well as nWEFCOM) has been clearly shown (refer to **section 3** for details). In the case of DPKYFC, the degree of

Hunting of tiger prey (and very occasional direct killing of tigers); allowing domestic livestock to roam freely in the forest which may (i) introduce diseases to wild tiger prey, and (ii) lead to tigers killing domestic livestock, encouraging tigers to come closer to villages and increasing chances of human-tiger conflict; illegal logging, which may be accompanied by opportunistic hunting; and collection of NTFPs in areas used by tiger prey and tigers, which may cause prey and/or tigers to move away from this human disturbance; are all remaining challenges to a greater or lesser extent in each of the target areas (see **Section 3** for more details). Proposed

3) Please spell out acronyms in first occurrence, such as TLNP, TYN-HKK, PSNP, TPNP, DYWS, SBCC, PACs, SMART, NCAPs, etc.

4) Please indicate exemplary domestic livestock species/types that is considered to introduce what kind of diseases to what specific tiger prey species/types in the proposed project sites.

5) It is unclear what/where the section 3.3.3 is. Please ensure the document has correct references.

## Addressing barriers

In the Project ToC, the following barriers were identified (also see section 3.3.3 above):

- 6) Please include an explanation how the context fits within the Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program agenda in this Rationale section, since this is the child project under the program.
  - 7) The GEF investment does not support the artificial introduction of animal from captive breeding centers. Please ensure such activity is not covered by the GEF investment and please find alternative co-financing to cover, if needed.
  - 8) The several paragraphs under "Baseline and future narratives" and under "Baseline or business-as-usual scenario (without the GEF project)" are identical and repeated/redundant. Please improve the flow of description and avoid redundancy.
  - 9) The last paragraph under Incremental [cost] reasoning and the first paragraph under Project justification are almost identical and redundant. Please improve the flow of description and avoid redundancy. In the latter, SSMART patrolling is mentioned, please correct typo or explain if it is not meant to be SMART and something else.
  - 10) Please name and number the Table in Incremental [cost] reasoning to facilitate references.
- b) Not fully. The Paragraph on Stakeholder engagement is generic and vague (e.g., 'several other government agencies'...). There is no specific reference to the private sector. Please elaborate and be explicit.

c) N/A

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Kindly note that corn and cassava have been mentioned as two of the most prominent cash crops. Thank you very much for your advice on reconsidering including raising of free roaming livestock inside the forest which is now removed.

2.Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that reference to Section 3 is now removed in the CER online version as well as the word versions.

3.Thank you very much for your comment, as advised we have spelt out the acronyms.

4.Thank you for your comment. Kindly note that lumpy skin disease as the main disease is already referred to in the

relevant section of the CER

5.Thank you for your comment. We apologise for the error in including reference to Section 3.3.3 which is now removed.

6.Thank you for your comment. As advised, we have included explanation now on the context fitting within the WCD IP agenda in the Rationale section. This is highlighted in yellow in the online CER template.

7.Thank you very much for your clarification. Kindly note that the GEF financing will not support introduction of animals from captive breeding centres. The relevant activity has been rephrased to reflect that the activities will not support ex-situ conservation or captive breeding efforts. Such activities will be supported by cofinancing.

8.Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the redundancies have been addressed by removing the section on baseline and future narratives as it was erroneously included while baseline or business as usual scenario has been retained.

9.Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the redundancy has now been removed by removing the duplicated justification paragraph from the incremental reasoning section. We have also corrected SSMART to read SMART.

10. Kindly note that we have named and numbered the Table in incremental cost reasoning

10b).Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the relevant section is updated to include involvement of the private sector and highlighted in yellow in the online version as well as included in the uploaded clean and track changes versions of the CER.

#### **5 B. Project Description**

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

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the**

overall program goal and approach?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 1, 2025 /VC Apr 9, 2025)

a) For the ToC diagram, the narrative refers to Figure 10, while the diagram is labelled as Figure 1. Please correct/maintain consistency.

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

e) Yes

f) Yes

g) Yes

h) Yes

i) Not fully. There are only means of engagement of stakeholders in Table 2. Please include the organization types/nature, their role in the project as well.

j) Not quite. Please strengthen this aspect. Please ensure that activities reflected in the Gender Action Plan are also reflected in the project document (e.g. project description, components, outputs and activities), and the results framework.

k) Yes

l) Not clearly. Please include a paragraph on this.

m) Yes

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a. Kindly note that we have changed the reference from Figure 10 to Figure 1 in the CER. Kindly note that the reference to Figure 10 is in the ProDoc which is correct.

i. Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have reworked the Table 2 to include organisation types/nature, their role in the project as well. This is shown in yellow highlights in the online CER and also in the uploaded clean and track changes word versions.

j. Thank you very much for your advice. As advised, the activities reflected in the Gender Action Plan are now also reflected in the project document and results framework.

l. Thank you for your comment. However, kindly note that this is not relevant to the project as the project activities are being implemented primarily in DNP jurisdiction areas and there are no activities that require policy alignment or policy coherence with those of other line agencies or departments. Hence, such risks are not relevant for this project.

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

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 27, 2025 / HF Apr 11, 2025)

a)

1) In Figure 2 Project Organogram (page 39 of the pdf version of CER document), UNODC is included as partners but its role is not explained in any other part of the project document. Please explain or remove as appropriate. Please also use the updated GEF-8 program name Wildlife Conservation for Development (WCP), rather than GWP (Global Wildlife Program), which was used under GEF-7.

2) In Table 2: means of engagement for different stakeholder groups (page 40 of the pdf version of CER document), please also indicate types of groups/organizations and their expected role or relevance to the project.

3) Please spell out OPA, IPA, OP, etc. indicated under GEF Agency's role, where it is first indicated in the section. It appears that IPAs and OPAs are mixed. Please ensure the document is using a consistent and correct reference.

b) If GEF agency execution role on this child project is not foreseen, please choose No in the portal entry.

c)

1) Please be more specific- e.g., please indicate specific names of projects, e.g., not just "Panthera ongoing and future support....", and indicate the projects/program timeline, location and approximate budget/scale, and indicate how/in what aspect the proposed project will seek synergy.

2) Please include a discussion of baseline and ongoing GEF projects in Khao Yai area on which this investment builds, including previous phases of GWP with IUCN (e.g., GEFID 9527). For those other projects currently listed please provide a discussion of how this project is complimentary and provides a strong increment/additionality.

3) In 2023 the GWP annual meeting was held in Bangkok with a field visit to Khao Yai and Thap Lan National Parks which are both implementing SMART technology successfully. How will this project build on what is already present in this area? And support sustainability of use and impact.

4) Please refer to and note how project investments in rangers will address/align with best practice re: International Ranger Foundation (IRF) and Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA) code of ranger conduct and ranger competencies and ranger welfare resources. Please see GWP PPG guide and refer to URSA online resources for more detail.

d) Unclear in this section. Please describe it explicitly.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a)

1. Thank you for your comment. As advised, we have removed UNODC from Figure 2 Project Organogram. We have also replaced GWP with WCD.

2. Thank you very much for your feedback. We have now reworked Table 2 to indicative types of groups/organisations and their expected role or relevance to the project.

3. Thank you for your comment. We have now spelt out the acronyms used earlier.

b) Thank you for your feedback. We have clearly now indicated in the portal that IUCN will not be involved in execution.

c)

1. Thank you very much for the comment. Kindly please note that there are a large number of activities agreed by each NGO in the MoU signed with DNP (163 in total). Many of these do not have specific project titles yet. We have inserted the relevant links to these agreements for your kind confirmation.

2- Thank you for your feedback. Kindly be informed that 9527 is already discussed in the ProDoc in the appropriate section on previous projects and lessons learned. This section in the CER relates to future collaboration of this proposed project with other activities that will still be ongoing when this project will be implemented ? and does not include reference to projects that are already closed. Some text has been added to address the final part of your comment.

3. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that these aspects are already included in detail in the document. For your information, SMART is being implemented successfully, but there are gaps ? as described in the section on gaps ? for example SMART planning and analysis is not carried out in a fully integrated manner for the complex as a whole, but rather on a PA by PA basis ? each having their own planning, budget, manpower, analysis and adaptive management response. There are gaps in communications coverage which reduce efficiency of rapid responses to incidents, ranger safety and emergency evacuation, etc. As described in the document, the project will address these gaps.

4. Thank you very much for your comment, Kindly note that Thailand has developed its own customised SMART patrolling protocol, training modules and guidelines that are tailored to address specificities for tiger conservation in SE Asia. The training centre established through GEF5 investment in Huai Kha Kheng has become a centre of excellence for training rangers and relevant forest officials from other SE Asian countries. During the inception period of this project, the PMU will assess options of adopting as appropriate IRF and URSA resources that complement the existing effective SMART patrolling system.

d. Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have reworked this section and described explicitly.

### 5.3 Core indicators

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

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 2, 2025 /OP Apr 9, 2025)

a)

1) Please explain the significant reduction of CI 1.2 (PIF: 1,576,000 ha; CER doc: 953,500 ha) and CI 11 (PIF: 90,000; CER doc: 22,000). Please include the explanation under the CI table, in the methodology section/

2) Please include METT score baseline for each Protected Area at CEO Endorsement request for CI 1.2. Please also upload the METT worksheets in the portal.

3) Some of the indicated protected areas lack WDPA ID numbers. Please include them or explain.

b) Yes. However, please consider including CI 3 targets on restoration.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a.

1. Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have added detailed explanation under the CI table in the methodology section.

2. Thank you very much for your feedback. We have uploaded the METT reports for each of the 13 Pas as well as added them to the core indicator sheet and the core indicators section of the online CER template. Upon completion we will include all the scores in the CI worksheet

3. Kindly note that these PAs do not have WDPA IDs as they are not registered on the WDPA system as of yet.

b. Thank you for your comment. Kindly note that restoration is no longer a major objective as a result of which we are not including any CI 3 targets.

#### **5.4 Risks**

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

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

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

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please (NN Mar 27, 2025 /OP Apr 9, 2025 / HF Apr 11, 2025)

1) Please include description how the overall Risk was identified, in the Risk table.

2) Some risk rating and mitigation measures are missing (Institutional and Policy; Financial and Business Model). Please complete.

3) Please ensure there are strong safeguards in place for prey reintroduction activity, and the risk section to address the risk, taking into account the potential for: (i) increasing incidence of human-wildlife conflict (HWC) depending on the sort of prey (e.g., prey eating crops?) and (ii) if and when predator numbers increase there needs to be in place strong safeguard measures to prevent and mitigate HWC (human tiger conflict).

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have included description on how the overall Risk was identified. This is included in the online CER as well as the clean and track changes word version.

2. Thank you for your feedback. Kindly note that the section already includes Institutional and Policy and Financial risks.

3. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that will be addressed through ESMS documents including the ESMP.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

a)

1) Please improve this section. This section contains plain copy and paste from the GEF-8 Programming Direction, which is not necessary. Instead, please indicate clearly how the project activities and outcomes are aligned with the proposed GEF-8 strategies. Please also remove and update some outdated reference such as Post-2020 GBF.

2) Since the project is proposing alignment with the GEF LD focal area, please include Core Indicator 3.

3) The project is not very clearly aligned with Climate Change Mitigation nor does it include tangible Core Indicator 6 targets. Unless the project clearly intends to capture GHG emission reduction with CI 6, suggest removing reference to alignment with CCM focal area nor relevance to NDC/UNFCCC contributions.

b) Yes

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a)

1. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this section is now reworked and included in the CER online version in yellow highlights and also in the clean and track changes word versions.

2. Thank you very much for your advice. Kindly note that as the project is not contributing significantly to LD, we are not including Core Indicator 3.

3.Thank you for your comment. As advised, we have removed reference to alignment with CCM focal area.

**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

(NN Mar 31, 2025)

1) Alignment to IUCN Strategic framework is indicated, however, this appears to be a generic regional priority that was written for the Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program, Indo-Malaya Regional Coordination Program. Please include reference that is more specific to Thailand and this child project under WCP.

2) For the reference made to international commitment, please indicate the years of targets, commitments and MoUs.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1.Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this is now corrected and reworked in the concerned section and included in the online CER as well as the clean and track changes word versions.

2.Thank you for your advice. Kindly note that as this level of detail is not currently available, we have removed reference to international commitments.

**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

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Numerous targets of KMGBF are proposed. Please indicate how exactly the project will contribute to the proposed targets. Please also identify the primary and secondary targets, since there are numerous.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that now a table has been added showing how the project contributes to each target. As advised, we have indicator certain targets that reflect the overall objectives of the project as primary targets, and targets that reflect more the approach of the project in moving towards those objectives as secondary targets.

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Annex H Gender Analysis and Action Plan is uploaded.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 2025)

No. Please upload.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan is now uploaded as a separate document.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025 /IM Apr 9, 2025)

We note that IUCN uploaded the ESMS Screening Clearance Form and ESMP. The project is classified the ESS risk as high risk. The ESMS Screening Clearance Form said that "Out of 291 "important" communities, the project document identifies that up to 11 villages may include Indigenous Peoples" and "The project includes areas where IPs have been historically marginalized." However, we failed to find information of consultation with affected local communities and Indigenous Peoples (ethnic minority groups) in the ESMP.

- 1) Please provide information of stakeholder consultation with affected local communities and Indigenous Peoples (ethnic minority groups) with date and name of the groups.
- 2) Please also provide information of how the results of consultation have been integrated into the project design.
- 3) Please also provide information of how representatives of affected local communities and Indigenous Peoples (ethnic minority groups) will be able to participate as a part of Project Steering Committee.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the required information is included. In terms of consultations, please note that there were primary stakeholder consultations undertaken in the Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex, which do not have indigenous peoples as defined as ethnic groups in Thailand. The consultations were with the local communities. We have now included this information on consultations with the local communities in DPKY.

2. Thank you very much for your advice. Kindly note that we have now added information of how the results of consultations with non-IP local communities in Dong Phrayayen Khao Yai forest complex have now been integrated into the project design.

3) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the representative of local communities will be involved in the Protected Area Committees, 25 people need to be represented from nine categories including representative of the villages. Occasionally the PSC will involve

relevant concerned stakeholders on decisions related to tiger conservation, e.g. Ministry of Transportation might be consulted on mitigation of roadkill incidents and PAC members on specific PAC related issues.

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Yes

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 31, 2025 / OP Apr 9, 2025)

Please remove the cost item "Miscellaneous costs during inception period" as it is not an eligible category, or please provide further details to be reconsidered.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that now miscellaneous is replaced with project start up workshop related expenses.

**8.3 Source of Funds**

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 31, 2025)

Yes

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

(NN Mar 31, 2025 / OP Apr 9, 2025)

1) For the co-financing letter from WCS, the letter indicates Public Investment/ Investment Mobilized. While in the Co-financing Table, it is inserted as in-kind/recurring expenditures. The details of the co-financing suggest that it may actually be in-kind/recurring expenditure. Please reconfirm the nature of co-financing, and fix either the co-financing letter, or the portal entry.

2) For co-financing from WWF, In-kind/Public Investment/Grant and Recurrent expenditures/Investment Mobilised are both indicated in the co-financing letter. However, the portal entry is indicated as 100% in-kind/recurring expenditure. The details of the co-financing suggest that it may actually be in-kind/recurring expenditure. Please reconfirm the nature of co-financing, and fix either the co-financing letter, or the portal entry.

3) For co-financing from Zoological Society of London, In-kind/Grant and Investment Mobilized are indicated in the co-financing letter. The portal entry is 100% Grant/Investment Mobilized. The details of the co-financing suggest that it may actually be in-kind/recurrent expenditure. Please reconfirm the nature of co-financing, and fix either the co-financing letter, or the portal entry.

4) IUCN co-financing letter is missing. Please upload it in the portal.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

## Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the cofinancing is in the form of in-kind/recurrent expenditure. The portal entry is now fixed to reflect the correct form of cofinancing.

2. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the cofinancing is in the form of in-kind/recurrent expenditure. The portal entry is now fixed to reflect the correct form of cofinancing.

3. Kindly note that the cofinancing is in the form of in-kind/recurrent expenditure. The portal entry is now fixed to reflect the correct form of cofinancing.

4. Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that the IUCN cofinancing letter is now uploaded.

### **Annex B: Endorsements**

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

### 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

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

Yes.

### 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

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

1) The letter is missing the mandatory footnote pertaining to the executing agency, "*Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate*". Please request an email from OFP explicitly accepting this footnote and upload it in the GEF portal.

2) There are minor mismatches in the CEO endorsement request, not matching with the exact amount indicated in the LoE. Please ensure the CEO endorsement request contains the same amount.

3) In the portal entry, please include Date of the OFP endorsement in Annex B.

**ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENT**

**GEF Agency(ies) Certification**

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
GEF Agency Coordinator	2/4/2025	Janie Rioux		janie.rioux@iucn.org

**Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):**

Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template.

Name of GEF OFP	Position	Ministry	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
Jatuporn Buruspat	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Royal Thai Government	

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that we have received an email confirmation accepting the footnote which is now uploaded in the GEF portal.

2. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the CEO endorsement request figure has now been corrected.

3. Thank you for your feedback. Please note that due to a bug in the portal we were unable to select the date from the drop-down option. Kindly note that now it is entered as requested.

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

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

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 31, 2025 /HF Apr 11, 2025)

a) CI 1.2 and CI 11 are included. However, please explain the significant reduction of CI 1.2 since the PFD/PIF stage. Please include the explanation in the narrative as well as under the Core Indicator Table, section to explain the methodological approach. Also, as in the earlier comments above, please consider including CI 3 for restoration activities.

b) At least 5% increase in METT score appears modest. Also, the baseline METT scores were not included in the Core Indicator table. Please provide baseline METT score, and based on them please reassess whether 5% increase is still considered adequate, and adjust or explain.

c)

1) Output 1.1.4 indicator targets indicate 500 people living in the project areas who have improved understanding and support implementation of the tiger restoration project (350 men, 150 women). There is a big difference between the number of men and women. Please explain.

2) Output 4.1.2 Indicator target indicates number of DNP staff increased capacities - which is not sex aggregated. Please include sex aggregated target and explain any significant difference between men and women exists, if any.

d) Yes

e)

1) Under Component 2, only the indicators regarding law enforcement to combat wildlife crime are included. Please also include indicators for addressing poaching: e.g., Extent of (i) poaching or other illegal killing of wildlife at project sites; (ii) anti-poaching measures or capabilities in place at project sites.

2) Required GWP core indicators seem to be missing from the project results framework. Please refer to the GWP PPG & M&E guidance documents and ensure that all requirements have been met, prior to resubmission, including GWP core indicators integrated into results framework and M&E plan.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the explanation is now included in the narrative as well as under the Core Indicator Table for significant reduction of CI 1.2

b. Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that we have now adjusted it to 7% increase.

c)

1) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this reflects the current reality of the composition of the PA PACs and we have also adjusted the indicator wording to end with ?including local stakeholders?.

2) Thank you for your feedback. Kindly note that now the figure is adjusted to 150 women versus 450 men. This is due to the fact that a large number of rangers are men as opposed to being women.

e)

1) Thank you very much for your comment. However, it seems there is some level of misunderstanding. Kindly note that Component 2 is not about anti-poaching measures inside the PAs but is more about addressing the trafficking supply chain outside the PAs. Indicators (i) and (ii) mentioned in this comment are in fact included as indicators of Output 1.1.2 in the indicator: *?Number of threats (evidence of poaching of tiger and prey;; poaching camps) encountered/ 1,000km. of patrolling?* which is a standardized metric that has been used in relation to tiger recovery in TYN-HKK ; and the indicator for output 4.1.2 *? Number of DNP staff with increased capacities?* of which anti-poaching capability is a key element

2) Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that these are already included in the results framework with GWP core indicators among the mix of indicators including project specific indicators.

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Mar 26, 2025)

1) Please provide more detailed maps to show the locations of national parks and sanctuary in each DPKY and WEFCOM area. Please demarcate the 5 main areas and 5 minors areas in WEFCOM in the map. Please also clearly show the five PAs in DPKY selected as major focus for the GEF investment.

2) Please explain sWEFCOM and nWEFCOM where they are meant to be, where they are referred first time in the document.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for your feedback. Kindly note that maps are now uploaded including demarcation of 5 main areas and 5 minor areas in sWEFCOM. In addition, as advised we have shown the five PAs in DPKY selected as major focus for GEF investment.

2. Thank you very much for your comment. As requested, we have explained sWEFCOM and nWEFCOM from the first instance of mention.

### **Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

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

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025)

Annex G Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) is uploaded.

1) Reference to GWP is included in ESMP. Global Wildlife Program (GWP) is a previous name under GEF-7. Where it specifically refers to GEF-8 program, please update it to GEF-8 Wildlife Conservation for Development (WCD) Integrated Program.

05/21/2025: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

1. Thank you very much for the comment. As advised, we have changed the reference to WCD IP instead of GWP IP.

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(NN Apr 3, 2025 / OP Apr 9, 2025)

a)

1) In the Budget Matrix worksheet in excel file, Executing agency A and Executing agency B columns indicated. Please insert the specific names of the Executing agency.

2) In the CEO Endorsement Request document, Annex G Project Budget table is over 20 pages long. Please make it more compact and legible. Please present the budget by component rather than by Outcome and use acronym as necessary for the executing entity column. Once the reformatted budget is received, full comments on budget will be provided.

b)

1) purchase of vehicle is included at USD 50,000. Please provide justification why purchase of vehicle is needed, and consider vehicle rental as a preferred option.

2) Please provide more details on budget item under 11. Works, on Activity 1.1.1.4 "Release of prey species into the wild". In addition to explaining the cost breakout (total USD 200,000) and unit (the unit is "individuals" - are these meant to be number of people providing works? or individual prey species?), please explain where such prey species will be originated/obtained from. Please also explain what is actually being proposed under the project (e.g., is it paying for the transport and reintroduction? or captive breeding etc.?).

3) Please clearly show budget for active engagement in the GWP knowledge platform. Is the budget item 7. Trainings, Workshops, Meetings, Activity 4.1.1.2 "Knowledge exchange visits" (USD 80,000) supporting it?

4) Budget item 7. Trainings, Workshops, Meetings, Activity 2.1.2.4 Engagement/Meeting with zoos, is not eligible. The GEF investment does not support ex-situ approach. Please remove from the GEF project budget, and if needed, find co-financing to cover such activity and clearly indicate it in the project document.

c) TORs for PMU, Tiger Technical Committee and for Project Steering Committee are uploaded as Annex.

05/21/2025: Comments were not fully addressed.

re 1) Purchase of motorized vehicle has been justified and is hereby approved by the Program Manager.

Other comments:

- i) In the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view (which is the document that will be circulated for Council review - see attached file), the columns after the components (in red color rectangle below) have no heading. Assuming they are Sub-total - M&E - PMC, please ask the Agency to include them.

- ii) The budget line "Sub-contracts to executing partner / entity" for \$135,000 (in green color rectangle below) seems to be an administrative cost. Please remind the Agency that administrative costs can't be covered by GEF resources - please remove this budget item as well as to explaining in which budget items the funds will be redistributed.

- iii) Most of the other budget lines (in purple rectangle below) have no description because the budget table lacks the column "Detailed Description". Hence, we cannot assess the reasonability of the different budget lines charged to project components - M&E - PMC. Please provide a detailed and succinct description by adding such column.

- 

Expenditure Category	Component							Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity
	1	2	3	4					

Sub-contract to executing partner/ entity	135,000				135,000			135,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant
---	---------	--	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	--

Contractual Services – Individual	286,400	72,000	0	104,800	463,200	53,294	0	516,494	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Contractual Services – Company	0	30,000	0	45,000	75,000	0	0	75,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Local Consultants	150,000	0	324,000	75,000	549,000	0	0	549,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	53,076	17,692	17,692	26,538	114,998	27,000	152,002	294,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	153,000	40,500	0	383,000	576,500	9,000	0	585,500	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	55,000	61,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Office Supplies					0		9,000	9,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
Other Operating Costs	50,000	0	0	30,000	80,000	0	0	80,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,619,476</b>	<b>339,192</b>	<b>441,692</b>	<b>664,338</b>	<b>4,064,698</b>	<b>95,294</b>	<b>216,002</b>	<b>4,375,994</b>	

The comments provided on May 23rd

05/29/2025: Comments were not fully addressed:

- The budget lines have a description ? however, now the budget lines are containing more than one item (see example below in red rectangles), which prevents us to assess the reasonability of charging the different activities / positions to project components / M&E / PMC. Please present a budget with individualized items (activities / positions / expenditures), with concise information, and with correct calculations. Then we will be able to cross-check some of these (specially the positions) with the TORs that might be in the Project Document.

<b>Contractual Services – Company</b>	Two contracts will be awarded to companies as follows: (i) Contract to establish digital tiger platform - a repository for all tiger data, information, research reports and communications materials/knowledge products; including publicly accessible elements and protected elements. (ii) Contract to establish data management system for identification and tracking of captive tigers, to prevent leakage into the illegal wildlife trade supply chain.	0	30,000	0	45,000	75,000	0	0	75,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
<b>Local Consultants</b>	Local consultants for the following activities: Activity 1.1.1.1 Rapid Assessment of Landscape connectivity; Activity 1.2.2.1 Develop model of improved livestock management approach and agreements with communities; Activity 3.1.1.1 Fund to communities to support livelihood development activities in DPKY; Activity 3.1.1.1 fund to communities to support livelihood development activities (consultant to study communities in sWEFCOM); Activity 3.1.1.2 Community livelihood assessment; Activity 3.1.2.1 Developing innovative financing mechanisms; Activity 4.1.1.1 Communications Specialist and Kiv Specialist; Activity 4.1.2.1 METT specialist	150,000	0	324,000	75,000	549,000	0	0	549,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
<b>Salary and benefits / Staff costs</b>	Costs of salary and other benefits for full-time (60 months) national project coordinator, project finance assistant and project admin assistant, and costs of part-time safeguards and gender specialist, and MEL specialist (25 months each).	53,076	17,692	17,692	26,538	114,998	27,000	15,202	294,000	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)
<b>Trainings, Workshops, Meetings</b>	This includes all costs of project inception and closure workshops; regular meetings with partners; biennial tiger conference; meetings related to various thematic issues related to management of forest complexes and recovery of tigers; meetings of experts to develop training curricula; trainings on Tiger Assessment Methods; on SMART	153,000	40,500	0	383,000	576,500	9,000	0	585,500	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)

- Please also present more details for 'Other Operating Costs'? it is unclear how the GEF funds will be used? please note that in principle, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities cannot be covered with GEF resources.

Per the resubmission, we will review the budget again and provide comments as appropriate.

06/09/2025: Has been addressed by the agency as explained in the response box below.

Agency Response

IUCN, June 6, 2025

Thank you very much for the comment. Kindly note that we have now uploaded the corrected budget in the GEF template providing details on expenditure categories as well as by activities.

Kindly note that more details have now been provided on the other operating costs budget line. Please note that none of the budgets relate to repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities.

**IUCN, May 29, 2025**

i) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the column headings have now been added

ii) Thank you very much for the feedback. Please note that the costs under sub-contracts to executing/partner entity are not administrative costs. This budget line will support the costs of surveying and monitoring of tigers in selected protected areas.

iii) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly be informed that the requested column is now added to the Annex D Detailed Budget as well as Annex G GEF Budget Template in the CER.

**IUCN, May 21, 2025**

a)

1- Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that Column B which was superfluous is now removed as there is only one executing agency, Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation

2. Kindly note that this is now corrected with the budget now shown at the level of components

b)

1) Thank you very much for your comment. If we may kindly clarify that the vehicle is not to be used by the PMU for travel within cities or between Bangkok and the project site. Instead, the vehicle will be used for patrolling within the DPKY forest complex. As vehicle rental companies, do not offer rental services within PAs, the hiring of vehicles is not a possibility as a result of which we are resubmitting this request for purchase of SMART patrolling related vehicle.

2) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the project will pay for transport and reintroduction and not for captive breeding. The number of individuals referred to here are the number of individual prey species with the unit costs being for transportation and reintroduction into the PAs.

3) Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the project coordinators international travel budget will cover these costs. In addition, as has been the practice, the World Bank/WCD pays for the costs of child project Executing Agency representatives attending the WCD Annual Conference.

4) Thank you very much for your comment. If we may kindly clarify that the engagement with private zoos as opposed to government run zoos is not related to ex-situ conservation. One of the objectives of this engagement is to ensure that these zoos are complying with the relevant regulations, have the required capacity to enforce these regulations and are also being monitored for potential trafficking related activities.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement 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

Apr 3, 2025

Not at this time. Please address the comments above and resubmit.

05/21/2025: No. Please address remaining comments on the budget.

05/29/2025: No. There are still remaining comments on the budget.

06/09/2025: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/3/2025</b>	<b>5/21/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/27/2025</b>	<b>5/29/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/29/2025</b>	<b>6/6/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/9/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		