

Improving biodiversity mainstreaming in the agro-forestry and fishery sectors in S?o Tom? and Principe

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10570

Countries

Sao Tome and Principe

Project Name

Improving biodiversity mainstreaming in the agro-forestry and fishery sectors in S?o Tom? and Principe

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

4/1/2022

Review completed by PM

7/7/2022

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
April 13, 2022

Yes, the project is aligned with the BD1.1 objective on mainstreaming.

Agency Response
Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 7, 2022

Addressed.

June 17, 2022

A new letter signed by the executive directors of agricultural cooperatives would make it. However, it is still a letter from the Ministry of Agriculture that is available in the portal. Please, clarify.

April 13, 2022

- We take note of the cofinancing in kind from communities. However, it is not sure that it is up to the Ministry of Agriculture to produce such letter. Wouldn't it be possible to provide an evidence from local communities or their cooperatives? Please, clarify.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

An additional co-financing letter, signed by the Executive Directors of five agricultural cooperatives, has now been provided and will be included in the resubmission for CEO endorsement.

5 July 2022

The letter has now been uploaded in the portal correctly

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 17, 2022

Addressed

April 13, 2022

- We take note of the change with the PIF: no more targets under 4.3, decrease of areas under restoration, no more agricultural areas, but 4,481ha of forested lands (3.2), 20,000 had under 5 (marine areas under improved management to benefit BD, out of protected areas), 7,050 beneficiaries, 50% women.

- About the indicator 6.1, please consider a period of 20 years in your calculations and not 5 years. Correct the table.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

Indicator 6 GHG emissions mitigated has now been estimated for a 20-year period and the Core Indicators table was updated. The calculations are part of the mainstream work led by BirdLife in developing the STP Sustainable Finance Plan for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (2022). Relevant info is included in Additional Annexes / Annex 11, Table 2: Co2 Emission reduction calculation, page 198-199. It has been estimated that the project will restore 25% of the estimated total of 317,224 tons of CO2e mitigated, which amounts to 79,306.

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 17, 2022

Addressed

April 13, 2022

Yes. Some clarification would however been welcome.

Component 1

- 1.2.1: The initial process to renew the forest law was not completed. In which measure can you consider you will succeed? Have the problems in the past been well analyzed?

- 1.2.4: Update National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP): There are enabling activities under preparation with UNEP to update the NBSAP and align it with the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. You need to explain how you will avoid duplication of efforts. See also comments on the budget.

- 1.2.5: Are the conditions favorable to develop these two decrees on artisanal and recreational fisheries?

-1.3.1: are there follow-up activities after the development of a Biodiversity Expenditure Review in the agroforestry and fisheries sectors?

- 1.3.2: we understand that the initial PES will not be developed (disappointing in a BD mainstreaming project). How are considering the sustainability of the proposed actions related to Plan Vivo?

Component 2

2.3.2 Support to the development of community based enterprises / timber certification ? Feasibility Study

We are not sure that the development of timber certification can be addressed at the scale of this project. Moreover, the GEF cannot be associate to the extension of timber exploitation in intact forests. Can a feasibility study bring a significant information... to be demonstrated.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

Component 1

1.2.1.: The past experience did not have positive results since, after the discussion and validation workshop at that time, there was a change in the government and the Directorate for Forestry and Biodiversity (DFB) did not have the agility to rapidly bring back the discussion and engage the new government in the process. Considering that the process was held in 2017, it is now considered obsolete by the authorities, and it is not possible to validate its results. Thus, the project proposes to revisit this discussion and update the forest law that will be approved by the end of the GEF funding. In this context, the project will undertake the following tasks: a) engage all relevant stakeholders in the discussion of the forestry law; b) revise and update relevant legislation; c) promote a national campaign of advocacy & communication on the proposed forestry law; d) accompany its endorsement and validation at all levels; e) reinforce capacities of all relevant stakeholders regarding the implementation of the new forestry law. The strong engagement of the DFB and all relevant national institutions in the design process was demonstrated in the project design workshops where this activity was considered one of the priorities. The engagement of Birdlife International in the process is also a guarantee of a sound technical process.

1.2.4.: The inclusion of this activity was a result of a participatory process in which the Environment Directorate (DGA) demonstrated the priority of updating the NBSAP.

There was an apparent miscommunication within the DGA and, based on the information provided by the GEF Sec., this activity has now been removed from the project and resources allocated to reinforce other activities that would benefit from additional ones.

1.2.5.: As stated in "it is now considered obsolete Detailed Project Description", the new Fisheries Law was recently approved by the National Assembly of STP (November 2021). Article 14 of the new Fisheries Law identifies a set of compulsory regulations that must still be produced and legislated as certain specific issues were not developed within the law main text.

Extracted from Annex 2:

"Article 14 of the new Fisheries Law presents a set of compulsory regulations to legislate on some specific issues not specifically developed within the law main text. During the PPG, the Directorate of Fisheries proposed the support from GEF project to elaborate two of these regulations: artisanal fisheries and recreational fisheries. The project will support the costs of the consultancies and technical assistance required to develop these important legal instruments that will have great importance on the effective implementation of the new fisheries law."

The latest update is that the enactment of this law is expected to occur within the next 30-60 days. Please note support for the development of these two decrees has been explicitly requested by the National Fisheries Directorate. In addition, given the recent advancements in establishing the first MPAs in the country, the timing is ideal in terms of developing regulations about marine resource use that are clearly linked to national ongoing marine conservation interventions.

1.3.1.: As stated in "Annex 2 Detailed Project Description", once the analysis is completed, a summary producing biodiversity financing trends and status at national level will be produced for uptake of findings in the country. This policy guide will be disseminated and used to inform decisions. The Biodiversity Expenditure Review will also provide the baseline and the methodological foundations to develop a regular update.

Extracted from Annex 2:

"The main objective of the BER is to help policy makers reduce the harmful agroforestry (deforestation, overuse of pesticides and fertilizers) and fishery (the overexploitation of fish stocks) subsidies and tax rebates that have negative impact on the sustainability of the agroforestry and fishery sectors and biodiversity. This will allow the country to engage in policy reforms that lead to re-allocation of these resources towards biodiversity conservation strategies. The BER will provide the baseline and the methodological foundations to develop a regular update. This will inform STP national and sector policies on biodiversity conservation and sustainable agriculture."

In addition, as described on page 86, the national capacity building programme (activity 1.1.1.) will use the findings and tools from the public expenditure review within its training opportunities, outreach, engagement and policy dialogues.

1.3.2.: During the stakeholder consultation process, multiple biodiversity financing mechanisms were discussed. Although other PES mechanisms had been considered as potentially viable tools for implementation in STP, three other major options were identified as national priorities (according to the BirdLife developed: 'Sustainable Finance Plan for Biodiversity and Protected Areas in STP' (2022)): 1) Conservation Trust Fund; 2) Concession mechanisms for High Value Conservation Areas (HCVs); and 3) carbon finance through afforestation, reforestation and revegetation (ARR). Annex 11 presents a roadmap for the implementation of Plan Vivo in STP, including estimated costs and revenues and a detailed action plan. The proposition was based on a sound analysis of technical and financial feasibility.

Component 2

2.3.2.: The description of this activity has been revised to clarify these important issues (see paragraph 77 & 78). In particular, the revision emphasises that this activity aims to identify the most appropriate mechanism(s), which would be locally suitable and underpinned by local businesses (i.e. given the scale of the project and incipient nature of the system, an international certification approach would not be feasible): '[?]' While international schemes, such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), might be complex to implement in a country like STP due to its scale and current capacity limitations, there is a wide range of national, regional and international forest certification schemes (FCSs) that can be considered to draw lessons and identify opportunities. Yet, efforts to identify such a mechanism at national level remain incipient.? No logging would be allowed inside conservation areas, where intact forests are located (i.e. certified timber would be extracted only from areas where this type of use is already allowed): '[?]' Alongside other key criteria to be identified, a specific requirement would be: no logging would be allowed inside conservation areas, where intact forests are located (i.e. certified timber would be extracted only from areas where this type of use is allowed).?

In addition, we have also attached draft terms of reference for the consultancy related to this activity, clarifying specific tasks to be undertaken and expected outcomes (see Annex 12).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, also with a Theory of Change (diagram and narrative).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 7, 2022

Addressed. to be confirmed at PIR.

June 19, 2022

We will appreciate to find further practical information about the nature of GEB in future Project Implementation Reports (PIR) and the achievements of 4,481 ha of forested landscapes restored (3.2), 20,000 ha of fisheries under certification (5.1), and 79,306 tons of CO₂e (6.1).

Addressed.

April 13, 2022

Not fully addressed.

There is a generic text (paras 96-98) on the global environment benefits (GEB). However, what is expected in this section is an explanation, a narrative, on how you will reach the proposed targets under the different core indicators that are proxy to GEB. Please, correct.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

Additional paragraphs (99-101) added, explaining how the project will reach the proposed targets under different core indicators.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jun 17, 2022

Addressed.

April 13, 2022

There is a text on innovation and sustainability. Elements of upscaling are missing. Please, complete (using the results from KM, capacity building, institution reinforcement, diffusion of best practices, lessons, eventually upcoming investments...).

Agency Response

2 June 2022

Additional information on elements of upscaling added in paragraphs 104 and 105

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 17, 2022

Addressed.

April 13, 2022

Would not it be possible to provide more accurate coordinates than the Islands of Sao Tome and Principe? The proposed coordinates are not really indicative of where the project will take place in term of forest and agroforestry parkland restoration and coastal and marine area management. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

Additional maps have been added. See Figure 5: Location of options 6 and 7 identified within the national forest restoration plan and to be supported within this project; and

Figure 6: Location of fishing communities (both islands) and target area of marine habitat under improved practices in Prince.

In addition, specific geographic coordinates of the communities shown in Figures 4 and 6 (see Annex 14) have been provided.

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes

Agency Response
Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
June 17, 2022

Addressed

April 13, 2022

To be reinforced.

Socioeconomic benefits are developed in the paras 181-185. The proposed rationale is based on the improvement of the policy, institutional, and fiscal frameworks and the proposed training... The reasoning could be improved, notably highlighting the multiple benefits for local communities, farmers, and fishermen from integrated approaches combining conservation and sustainable use. It is not only a reinforcement of capacities that is expected, but the improvement of incomes and their sustainability. Please, reinforce the reasoning.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

The reasoning behind socioeconomic benefits has now been reinforced (see paragraph 185). We have added the following text:

Overall, the project will promote socioeconomic benefits for local communities, farmers, and fishers by not only ensuring that poverty reduction and development processes do no harm to biodiversity, but also recognising the potential of biodiversity for achieving desirable development outcomes. This change in mindset ? only achievable through an integrated approach to mainstreaming biodiversity ? will be key for creating sustainable and long-lasting behavioural change within the multiple sectors. By promoting enhanced food security and improved household incomes, local communities, farmers, and fishers will be incentivised to apply more environmental-friendly practices. Enhanced food security and improved household incomes will occur through project for support to marketing, agricultural productivity and nutrition (e.g. certification, micro-projects).?

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 7, 2022

Addressed.

June 17, 2022

- The points are addressed, but further comments may come from the quality control. In this view, we recommend you highlight the role of cofinancing in completing the project team and financing some of project coordination positions. For instance, when a position is financed at 46%, we may suppose that the rest (54%) is coming from cofinancing for complementary activities related to parallel projects (EU for instance).
- We take note that no vehicle will be purchased. We agreed that some costs of fuel, subsistence, and fieldworks will be covered by the GEF grant.

April 13, 2022

Budget

- We do not understand what " Plan Vivo administration fees (78,000\$)" means, but the GEF does not finance additional administration fees. Please, clarify and correct.
- We are seeing \$30,000 of international consultants and \$25,000" of national consultants to update the NBSAP. There is a risk of duplication with Enabling Activities under preparation. Please, confirm that this work will be done in coordination and synergy with the enabling activities currently under preparation by UNEP to prepare the implementation of the post 2020 global biodiversity framework. The GEF actually provides financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their work to review and align their national targets, NBSAPs, policy frameworks, monitoring frameworks and finance with the Global Biodiversity Framework.
- There is a line of financing for " Project Coordination": Please, pay attention to the formulation you employed to well reflect the nature of the work. All activities of coordination should be financed by the project management costs. It is also recommended to highlight the role of cofinancing in these lines of budget, especially for staffing.
- Similar comment for the item "Local Technical Assistance": these positions should be financed by pmc and not covered by the project outputs, except if you can make the demonstration that these positions will indeed help in delivering the technical outputs. Here also, highlighting the role of cofinancing in these positions would be welcome.
- The lines of budget referring to " finance & administration" should be covered by the pmc. Here again, highlighting the role of cofinancing to partially cover these positions would be welcome.
- Staff costs & miscellaneous (IFAD (\$167,619). Per guidelines, the pmc should finance specific activities, goods, and services as opposed to generic

terms. Miscellaneous is not acceptable and the nature of staff should be explained.

- To justify the coverage of staffing positions by technical components and/or pmc, GEF guidelines request clear Terms of Reference and definition of outputs.

Please, provide the terms of reference for the different positions.

- Please, confirm if vehicles will be purchased in the project. We just find the use of vehicle in one budget line. We understand that it will be a rental or provided by cofinancing (preferred option in GEF guidelines). Please, clarify.

Agency Response

2 June 2022

1-The values are related to the required verification, validation, and certification of the reduction of greenhouse emissions ? costs of developing and certifying a carbon project within Plan Vivo. The budget line was corrected accordingly.

2-Budget lines related to NBSAP update were eliminated. Other existing budget lines were reinforced: Biodiversity mainstreaming campaign; Technical Assistance to eco-certification activities; Sustainable Agricultural Production; Baited Remote Underwater Videos; Forest Restoration; Plan Vivo Validation and Certification; Mid Term Review and Terminal Evaluation. All of these budget lines had minor adjustments that will improve the capacity to deliver outputs and achieve outcomes.

3-The BirdLife expertise is core to deliver the technical outputs of the projects. These positions are not overlapping with PMC. The budget line terminology clarified (Biodiversity Expert, Chief Technical Advisor, Local Advisor to Principe, Biodiversity Mainstreaming Officer). BirdLife junior and senior experts will support all of the work packages included in Component 1 and will provide technical assistance to COMPRAN and DFB in component 2. Terms of reference clarifying the roles of the staff are detailed in Annex 13.

4-?The Chief Technical Advisor will [?] ensure that the implementation of the Project meets the highest technical standards and is informed by the latest thinking and best practice in conservation circles [and] provide technical expertise to the [?] outputs [1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1].?

[?]

?A key focus of the project is to mainstream environmental sustainability and biodiversity conservation. [?] the biodiversity expert will be engaged in all the project

outputs, supporting COMPRAN's management unit in the implementation of the project action plan.

The local Advisor to Principe will support COMPRAN's management unit and implementing partners in the implementation of all project activities in Principe Island.

The research and science officer will be responsible for the implementation of the Capitalisation of experiences Exchanges Production and dissemination of educational materials Creation of an electronic library Support the Environment Expenditure Review Process and define follow up actions.

5-The line of budget for BirdLife Administration, Finance, Procurement officers was incorporated into the Project Management Costs as suggested.

The Project Management Cost has now been disaggregated: COMPRAN-GEF project coordinator - 100% over 6 years @ \$24,000 (\$144,000) & BirdLife Administration, Finance, Procurement officers / time eq. 46% over 3 years @ pro rata of \$17,000/year

6-Annex 13 includes specific terms of reference for staff positions by technical components (see also detailed response above).

7-No vehicle will be purchased. The budget line refers to fuel to be used in project activities.

5 July 2022

This is correct. These positions are co-funded by other BirdLife-led projects and/or BirdLife core budgets. The staff are already in-post, full-time positions. By project launch, the experts therefore mobilised will be sharing tasks between this project and the other ones they have time allocated to. The percentage charged to the GEF corresponds to the estimated workload associated to ensure the necessary expertise to achieve the expected results in the framework of this project. BirdLife has provided IFAD with a co-financing letter covering the remaining working time allocation for these positions.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
June 17, 2022

Addressed.

April 13, 2022

No.

There was one comment at PIF level made by France about the coordination with other projects, for instance financed by the FFEM: " Principe is one of the pilot islands in the SMILO project to help Principe becoming an island labeled as sustainable".

Please, include the response in a table after the responses given to the GEFSEC and STAP comments.

Agency Response
2 June 2022

A response to the comment from France has now been included in the Appendix B table following the responses to the GEFSEC and STAP comments (see page 67 in Appendix B ? Response to Project Reviews).

In particular, it has been emphasized that "The project is thus fully aligned with the Sustainable Development of the Autonomous Region of Pr?ncipe?", contributing towards current conservation efforts as well as designed to draw lessons between areas (e.g. from Pr?ncipe to S?o Tom?) regarding sustainable islands."

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
April 13, 2022

Yes. Apparently, the planned amounts perfectly match with the PPG execution.

Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Jun 17, 2022

Addressed.

April 13, 2022

Yes.

However, would not it be possible to provide more accurate coordinates than the Islands of Sao Tome and Principe? The proposed coordinates are not really indicative of where the project will take place in term of forest and agroforestry parkland restoration and coastal and marine area management. Please, clarify.

Agency Response
2 June 2022

Additional maps have been provided: Figure 5: Location of options 6 and 7 identified within the national forest restoration plan and to be supported within this project; and Figure 6: Location of fishing communities (both islands) and target area of marine habitat under improved practices in Principe.

Geographic coordinates of the communities shown in Figures 4 and 6 have now been provided (see Annex 14).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 30, 2022

All points are addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

August 15, 2022

Please, address the comments from the Quality control on the following topics:

- Project information
- cofinancing
- M&E
- Utilization of PPG
- Core-indicators
- Budget

The full comments, including extracts from the portal or the prodoc are available in a word document logged into the Docs Tab and will be sent by email.

July 7, 2022

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

June 17, 2022.

Please, address the remaining comments on cofinancing and the budget.

April 13, 2022

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

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/7/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

8/15/2022

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

11/30/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations