



# Integrated Landscape Management for Addressing Land Degradation, Food Security and Climate Resilience Challenges in The Bahamas

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10694

**Countries**

Bahamas

**Project Name**

Integrated Landscape Management for Addressing Land Degradation, Food Security and Climate Resilience Challenges in The Bahamas

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/10/2021

**Review completed by PM**

4/12/2022

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**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

4/12/2022:

Cleared.

4/8/2022:

Please note Rio Marker '1' for Climate Mitigation is not showing as selected in the portal.

12/22/2021:

- Please consider including in Rio Marker a '1' given the work on restoration and the potential to deliver emissions avoided benefits (CI 6).

#### Agency Response

4/10/2022

The Rio Marker '1' for Climate Mitigation is now selected.

1/11/2022

Rio markers are already selected as 1 in both Climate Change Mitigation and Climate Change Adaptation in the portal and was specified in the CEO ER.

**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

4/11/2022:

Cleared.

4/8/2022:

-We note the inclusion of some of the targets in the Results Framework. Please ensure that the Indicators and Targets (both mid and end of project) are also included for Core Indicator 4.

- Under GEF-7, note the GEF will be providing individual country support through Enabling Activities for UNCCD reporting only. We are encouraging countries to utilize their project funds to integrate LDN into their national systems, which includes setting LDN targets. All other Enabling Activity support is not provided at individual country level, but global level for setting up UNCCD monitoring and reporting frameworks and building overall capacity for LDN implementation. We also do not see that the Bahamas was involved in the GEF-6 LDN Target Setting project. Noting this, please include in the project documentation, any further information on how the Bahamas plans to engage in the process to set LDN targets.

12/22/2021:

Not fully.

-As mentioned during the PIF level review, please include the expected tangible targets/results for all of the Outcomes. Currently we note the inclusion of indicators, some of which are reflected as targets.

-Please clarify which Output will be working towards setting LDN targets for The Bahamas. This does not appear to be mentioned in Table B or in the project description.

Please ensure this is reflected in Table B, the project description and the results framework.

### Agency Response

4/11/2022

-The indicator associated with Core Indicator 4 *area (ha) of landscapes under SLM practice across the 7 targeted islands?* and associated mid and end of project targets have been added to the results framework.

- Thanks for the clarification and recommendation. The project narrative has been amended to state that it will contribute to updating the NAP and formulation of LDN voluntary targets. This has been included in the Output 1.1.2 narrative with a brief explanation on how the country plans to engage in the LDN target-setting process.

1/11/2022

- The project results framework has been revised to include better-defined targets (results) at the outcome level that have been incorporated into the results framework.

- To note, since the LDN Target-setting process is supported under separate GEF Enabling Activity financing, the project will confine itself to establishment/strengthening of the land management decision-making platform upon which the LDN Target-setting be built; in this regard, the project itself will not undertake the specification of LDN targets. The DEPP has committed to initiate this EA engagement as a parallel process. Hence Output 1.1.1 will contribute the institutional framework that will facilitate the LDN target-setting programme. This is clarified in the Output 1.1.1 narrative of the CEO-ER (additional text highlighted). Under Output 1.1.2 it is clarified that within the upgrade of relevant land development policies, regulatory instruments and incentive regimes a primary consideration will be integration of the LDN target-setting process; the title of Output 1.1.2 is also modified to reflect this.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

### 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

4/22/2022:

Cleared.

4/18/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

Please spell out the acronyms IICA and CARDI.

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

12/22/2021:

-Please provide the missing co-financing letters.

-Please correct the portal entry for the letter from the Forestry Unit which indicates \$512,080.00.

-We welcome cofinancing and partnerships with farmer organizations and especially women producers. Please, ensure that these organizations are well empowered in the project implementation.

## Agency Response

4/19/2022

The acronyms IICA and CARDI have been spelled out in Table C

1/11/2022

- The co-financing letters available have been uploaded to the portal for all the remaining agencies. At this review iteration, the CF letters from (1) the Department of Physical Planning, (2) the Department of Gender and Family Affairs and (3) the Cat Island Conservation Institute have not been submitted to the DEPP. The DEPP continues to be follow-up with these agencies.

- The portal entry for the CF letter from the Forestry Unit has been updated to reflect \$512,080. Considering this revised CF amount for the Forestry Unit and the non-receipt of the co-financing letters from the three agencies, the overall CF has been adjusted to \$15,092,080.

- Noted and indeed the project development team and lead agencies placed significant emphasis on this aspect. Many of the leaders in the related sectors (environment and agriculture) in The Bahamas are women, which was emulated in the project

development process hence elevated sensitivity to gender-based empowerment. There is high confidence that this will be reflected through project implementation.

#### **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

4/22/2022:

Cleared.

4/18/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

-Audit should not be included under M&E budget but under PMC instead, please revise in the budget and also exclude from the M&E table.

-Amendment Request-Total requested GEF financing including fee, PPG, PPG fees at CEO endorsement is now \$6,425,000 as per new LOE and Portal entry: Please revise the Amendment Request and resubmit in Portal.

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

The major amendment request is technically cleared and recommended for approval.

12/22/2021:

- Please reassign office supplies to the PMC.

-Please make corrections to the Project Amendment Request. The Undisbursed Grant Amount and the Undisbursed Agency should match the newly requested grant amount and agency (inclusive of the additional STAR). Together with the PPG these should total \$5,754,452. as indicated in the OFP Endorsement Letter. Please also include under the Explanation section, the additional amount of funds to be added to the Project Financing and the Agency fees specifically .

#### Agency Response

4/19/2022

- The audit costs are under PMC; are excluded from the M&E Table

- Thank you for the observation; the Amendment Request is revised and resubmitted in the Portal

1/11/2022

- Costs for office supplies has been assigned to the PMC. This has been reflected in the budget annex.

- The Project Amendment Request has been amended (uploaded in Portal with amended documents). The Undisbursed Grant Amount is corrected to \$5,717,580 and the Undisbursed Agency corrected to \$543,170 which now match the newly requested grant amount and agency fee (inclusive of the additional STAR) and total \$5,754,452 (consistent with the OFP Endorsement Letter). Under the Explanation section, the additional amounts of \$388,128 and \$36,872 added to the Project Financing and the Agency fees respectively have been specified.

**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

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

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

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

12/22/2021:

-Please explore an increase in the targets for at least Core Indicator 4.3.

-Please provide (below the Core Indicator table in the Portal) an explanation of how the project is accounting for the Core Indicator targets, ensuring to clarify that the targeted sites for CI 3 and CI 4 are different, so as to avoid double counting. We note that in the response to Council comments the overall GEBs mentioned is 10,000ha. If this is correct the Core indicator table should reflect only 10,000 ha under 4.3 and not 20,000ha across 3.1 and 4.3. However we encourage the increase in overall hectares due to the size of the investment.

-Please also clarify the reduction in target beneficiaries and categories of beneficiaries.

### Agency Response

1/11/2022

- There was further consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and IICA to explore the potential for expansion of the project's spatial influence in terms of the landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems. It was determined that 17,300 hectares can be targeted under Output 2.2.1 in line with Core Indicator 4.3. This constitutes the wider arable landscapes, beyond the acreage to be targeted for restoration.

- The DEPP and the Ministry of Agriculture confirms that 10,000 hectares will remain be targeted for restoration under Output 2.1.1, in alignment with Core Indicator 3.1 as a separate acreage from what is reported under Core Indicator 4.3. This is now clarified in the narratives under Component 2 and the associated outputs, in the Core Indicator Table and the Results Framework. The total acreage under focus of the project is 27,300 ha.

- The reduction in the number of target beneficiaries was on account of further consultations and field assessment with the Department of Agriculture, where it was determined that there are no more than 1,000 farmers in the country engaged in productive agriculture. Hence the guidance is that the project can realistically target 700 farmers, although during implementation, efforts will be made to target all who are actively engaged. It should be noted that in addition to farmers, other beneficiaries will be targeted; these include community group members, students, technical personnel, and policy makers; the estimated number of beneficiaries is an additional 85 based on estimates provided by the national agencies. The numbers and the categories of stakeholders are specified in the results framework. There are community members and students for which the numbers will be determined at project inception (and noted in the results framework), hence it is expected that during implementation this number will be likely be higher. The overall total number of beneficiaries is 785, maintaining an approximate 50:50 gender split.

### 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

4/11/2022:



Cleared.

4/8/2022:

Thank you. Very minor note that Annex E is the Budget and the text in the portal submission has not changed. Under Section 1) **Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:** sub section Project sites: there is still reference to Annex A and E. The maps are under Annex D.

12/22/2021:

-The project sites sub-section under Project Description section 1a) makes reference to the confirmation of the sites at PPG phase. Please exclude and include language that indicates the sites have been confirmed. There is also reference to further information on the project sites in Annex A. However Annex A includes the Project Results Framework.

#### Agency Response

4/10/2022

-The numbering of the Annexes in the CEO-ER has been rectified to be consistent with the Portal. This has been also rectified/reflected in the Portal.

1/11/2022

- Thanks for the pointing out the error. The text has been modified to say that the project sites have been confirmed and the proper Annex E reference is now provided.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2022:

Cleared.

12/22/2021:

- If available, please provide details on the baseline as it relates to private sector related investments and initiatives to assist small farmers with accessing finance for SLM/restoration interventions?

#### Agency Response

1/11/2022

- The narrative under Private Sector Engagement of the CEO-ER document (reflected in the UNEP ProDoc under Section 5) have been updated to give more background on the current status of support to the private sector SMEs and small farmers in accessing finance for SLM and ecosystem restoration intervention. The narrative now includes the further background on the key private sector organizations that are involved in the value-chain that have been already engaged with the Ministry of Agriculture and IICA in partnership to support efforts to enhance uptake of CSA and good agricultural practices by producers. Investment in a commodity branding/certification for environmentally sustainable practices are being considered; this is included in the updated narrative. This information has been also carried to the Stakeholders Section of the CEO-ER.

**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

4/11/2022:

Cleared.

4/8/2022:

Thank you for the revisions. Please see a minor but necessary comment below.

- The Theory of change and the narrative describing the Theory of Change are a very important component of the Alternative Scenario. This must be included in the portal submission. Currently the ToC is only in the Appendix and the Intervention Logic (including the narrative on the pathways) is only in the body of the Project Document.

12/22/2021:

1. Please include here any changes that were made to the PIF.

2. Thank you for providing a Theory of Change. It would be useful to include the cluster barriers on the ToC diagram or which causal pathway boxes relate to which barrier cluster. This will help us to see how the project is addressing the barriers and those that may be outside of the scope of the project. Please also include the ToC diagram in the

portal submission as well as the Intervention Logic text that is currently in the project document.

### 3.Component 1

- The details on the establishment of the Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms on LDN being institutionalized have not been described. Please include

### 4. Component 3

-Output 3.1.2- Ensuring that the focus of the project remains on generating global environment benefits, we note there is no specific language on ensuring goods are produced using SLM/ restorative measures in the criteria for accessing grants. The access to grants should go beyond a focus on food safety standards. Please make this explicit.

5. Please include details on how the project is incorporating COVID recovery.

## Agency Response

4/10/2022

-The Theory of Change has been included within the preamble text of the proposed alternative scenario; this is now in the portal submission.

1/11/2022

1. The changes that were made from the PIF submission is included and highlighted in Table 7.

2. The Theory of Change diagram has been modified and now includes the barriers (represented by colour code) placed in association with representative causal pathway to show how the alignment of drivers upon which the outputs (activities) address the barriers. It should be noted that an attempt was already made to represent this in the problem tree analysis diagram (and objective tree diagram) but nonetheless incorporated as per recommendation.

### 3.Component 1

Further information/clarity on the modality for establishing the inter-sectoral coordination mechanism to support LDN has been included under Section 3, related to Output 1.1.1. The ISOF will comprise representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Department of Physical Planning, Department of Agriculture and the Forestry Unit and will be coordinated via the DEPP under its institutional remit provided for under the Environmental Planning and Protection Act (2019).

### 4. Component 3

- The narrative under Output 3.1.2 has been expanded to include recognition that the grant mechanism will stipulate its availability to farmers and community groups to support the establishment of new SLM, and climate-smart agri-businesses, or to expand related existing businesses and encourage investment in land conservation-oriented/climate-smart agricultural systems. It is also stated that SLM practices will be adopted at the policy level of the Ministry of Agriculture and integrated into BDB's lending policy. This will ensure that farmers who practice SLM will benefit from additional programs.

5. Additional references are now included on the project's alignment with the COVID recovery efforts under the Project overview sub-section in Section 3, noting the *Accelerated Bahamas Recovery Plan* and *The Bahamas National Pathway for Food Systems Transformation in support of The 2030 Agenda*, two important policy statements. This text has been carried to the narrative under Output 3.1.2 to provide context.

Under the Risk Mitigation Measures in Table 15 further information is provided on government support measures for COVID-19 impact mitigation for small farmers and fishers that will be an augment to the project contributions and vice-versa that is anticipated to lessen project execution risk.

Additional reference to COVID-19 recovery is given under the Private Sector Engagement section in the context of supporting recovery efforts.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022:

We note the additions to the Alternative Scenario section only.

12/22/2021:

-The inclusion of the focus on LDN that can serve as the basis for interventions for Integrated Landscape Management and climate resilient food production should be stressed.

## Agency Response

1/11/2022

- Moving toward LDN as the basis for interventions for ILM and climate-resilient food production has been further elaborated in the preambular paragraph of Section 3, Proposed alternative scenario. Content that emphasizes the linkages between ILM and LDN was already included in Table 10: Incremental Cost Reasoning.

**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

12/2/2021:

Yes.

## Agency Response

**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

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

12/22/2021:

-Is there an opportunity to institutionalize the idea around the grant mechanism?

-What are the plans to continue to incentivize small farmers to practice SLM after the project ends?

## Agency Response

1/11/2022

- The Ministry of Agriculture and support agencies will ensure that SLM practices will become an entrenched within fiscal support and lending policies around the grant mechanism that will be facilitated by the project. Additional text has been included in the narrative under Output 3.1.2 and under Section 7) ?Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up? to make explicit.

## 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

12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

**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

N/A

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

12/22/2021:

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

4/8/2022:

Noted.

12/22/2021:

Yes. However, please include a summary of the gender assessment in the portal submission.

#### Agency Response

1/11/2022

Appendix 18: GENDER STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN that is appended to the UNEP ProDoc has been uploaded to that section in the Portal.

#### **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

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

12/22/2021:

-The role of the private sector in the project does not appear to be confirmed or concrete. Please clarify how they were involved in the PPG phase and the commitments that have been made to support project implementation beyond co-financing.

-Please clarify what categories of private sector are being consulted or considered for the project- large commercial operators, or MSMEs etc

-It is not clear which group listed in the Stakeholder table represents the private sector. Please confirm or include.

#### Agency Response

1/11/2022

- During the PPG phase there were consultations with both state and private sector entities, some of whom are expected to partner with the project to deliver and implement a broad range of activities to reduce land degradation and promote several co-benefits, including enhanced food security and climate resilience. The expectation is that the demonstrations of applied technologies and training opportunities geared at creating a better understanding of underlying issues will stimulate positive change and actions that will extend far beyond the demonstration sites to have a significant and sustainable national impact.

- The Private Sector Engagement section includes the key private sector firms that have been consulted; these firms have been traditionally engaged in partnership initiatives with the Ministry of Agriculture and IICA in particular, and the narrative emphasizes that the project will build on these relationships. Roles and relationships to the project and opportunities for incentivizing engagement of the private sector is also made clearer. Key private sector interests working on investments in waste composting has been highlighted under Output 2.1.1. The narrative under Table 12: Project stakeholders and their roles, now identifies which stakeholders are private sector, and roles/engagement in the project.

**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

12/22/2021:

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

12/22/2021:

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



12/22/2021:

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

12/22/2021:

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

4/22/2022:

Cleared.

4/8/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) and identified risks particularly on climate change and involuntary restrictions on land/water use. The SRIF states that "SS 6, in particular, may need a social safeguard expert help in dealing with it and developing the management plan. Careful selection, capacity building and monitoring on safeguard risks would be needed for the grant mechanism that if project decides to roll it out." The ProDoc's Environmental and social safeguards section (3.11, page 56, para 120) also mentions that "[t]he findings from the SIRF will help to streamline and focus the incorporation of environmental and social concerns into the decision-making process, making project-level EIA a more effective process."

It is, however, not clear from neither SRIF nor ProDoc what is the Environmental Social Management Plan that the project will take to address the risks related to climate change and involuntary restrictions on land/water use particularly. Does the project plan to develop EIA and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) to identify the risks properly and manage the risks in the first year of the project? What are monitoring plan and budget for EIA and ESMP? Please clarify what actions are being planned during the early stage of the project, and provide a summary of identified risks, mitigation measures and risk management plans in the ESS section of the portal.

12/22/2021:

Yes

#### Agency Response

04/19/2022

The guidance was well-noted and accepted. The ProDoc's Environmental and social safeguards section has been clarified to emphasize that the social concerns will be incorporated into the decision-making process, making project-level safeguards assurance a "more effective process" and now specifying that a project Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will be developed at project inception. This will be developed from an "Environmental and Social Management Framework" that is now included as Appendix 22 of the UNEP ProDoc. This Framework specifies the significant safeguards identified in the Safeguard Risk Identification assessment (Annex 15). The Framework will be validated at project inception in a working session of the Technical Working Committee that will lay the basis for the scope of work in the formulation of the ESMP. Development of the ESMP is now incorporated within the draft terms of reference for the Project Coordinator, the Gender/Social Safeguards Specialist and the Agricultural Specialist and therefore the costs (budget) will be covered under the contract fees for these members of the PMU. Refer to the corresponding changes reflected in the Environmental and Social safeguards Section of the UNEP ProDoc. The Environmental and Social Management Framework from Annex 22 is now uploaded to the ESS section of the portal.

#### 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

12/22/2021:

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  
12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/11/2022:

Cleared.

4/8/2022:

Please see additional comment above under Q.2

12/22/2021:

-Please see question above on the core indicators and make corrections here where necessary.

Agency Response

4/10/2022

-Mid-term and end of project targets included in the results framework associated with Core Indicator 4.3 under Output 2.2.1

1/11/2022

- The project results framework has been updated as per recommendations related to the core indicators.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022:

Cleared

12/22/2021:

-See comments above on LDN and results.

Agency Response

1/11/2022

- The project narrative has been adjusted to bring clarity on how LDN is mainstreamed into policy under Section 3, under Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2; this is reflected in the results framework.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
12/22/2021:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
12/22/2021:

Yes

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2022:

All comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared.

4/18/2022:

Not at this time. Follow up comments to be addressed.

4/11/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

4/8/2022:

Minor comments to be addressed prior to technical clearance.

12/22/2021:

The CEO ER is not yet ready for technical clearance. Please address the comments above.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/22/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/8/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/11/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/18/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/22/2022</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**