

Mainstreaming biodiversity-based tourism in Thailand to support sustainable tourism development

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10409

Countries

Thailand

Project Name

Mainstreaming biodiversity-based tourism in Thailand to support sustainable tourism development

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/11/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

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
JS 6/22/2021- Table 1 is identical to that of the PIF, cleared.

Agency Response Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 6/15/2021

1- Former Output 2.3 ("*Sustainable tourism standards and impact monitoring promoted and deployed across Prachuap Khiri Khan. This will take place through (i) reinvigoration of the existing government Green Hotel scheme and its broadening to cover biodiversity conservation and embrace more tourism operators; and (ii) awareness-raising and training of provincial tourism officers, local governments, and local local tourism operators in avoiding, mitigating and monitoring tourism impacts.*") planned at PIF stage has disappeared. The CER states that former output 2.3 and 2.4 were combined to simplify. However, as described in the ProDoc, activities under 2.3 do not include impact monitoring. More fundamentally, former 2.3 was one of

the few project's contribution to "greening" tourism in general targeting a broader range of stakeholders, when former 2.4/current 2.3 are entirely related to developing "niche" green tourism and focus on local communities. It is unclear how the two could be combined and it is critical that the project keeps a strong contribution to greening unsustainable tourism (see comments on alternative scenario further down).

Please clarify how the outputs planned in PIF stage 2.3 are to be delivered or justify thoroughly the changes made, explaining how the project will still contribute to greening tourism in general, not just developing "niche" biodiversity-based tourism (see also comment on the alternative scenario further down).

The rest of the few changes made to table B are adequately justified and acceptable.

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

JS 6/15/2021- Total cofinancing is in line with that presented at PIF stage with a ratio of 1:7.5.

1- However, we note that there is no cofinancing from the private sector contrary to PIF stage where \$1.4 million from PTT and tourist operators/companies were envisaged. The CER explains that cofinancing from the tourism sector have not yet materialized because of COVID constraints but that (i) letters of support from Tourism Association of Prachuab Khiri Khan, Community-based Tourism of Prachuab Khiri Khan Association, and the Thai Responsible Tourism Association were obtained, and (ii) corresponding co-financing will be revisited during the course of the project.

1a-Please clarify where the letters of support (i) have been uploaded.

1b-Please also clarify why the anticipated co-financing by PTT, which does not depend upon tourism, has not been secured when a strong role is given to PTT in the project design (Member of Steering Committee, support to implementation of component 2 through the SRE Learning Center and other related programmes within PTT).

2 Some in-kind co-financing is reported as investment mobilized (IM) when it should be recurrent expenditures:

Government	Parks, Wildlife & Plant Conservation	Investment	mobilized	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment – Dept of Nat Parks, Wildlife & Plant Conservation	In-kind	Investment mobilized	3,746,656.00
Recipient Country	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment – Dept of	Public	Investment	4,007.00

Please correct.

3 Supporting information for the co-financing from (i) Dept of Nat Parks, Wildlife & Plant Conservation, (ii) Dept of Marine & Coastal Resources, (iii) Royal Forest Dept, (iv) Ministry of Tourism and Sports is provided in the form of a letter from BEDO, which, as we understand it, has no authority over these departments and ministry. Please provide co-financing letters from the co-financers, not from the EA.

Agency Response

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 JS 6/15/2021 - Yes, cleared.

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
JS 6/15/2021:

Please correct the typo in Annex C:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETI</i>	
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>€</i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	36,667	
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	33,333	
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	30,000	
Total	100,000.00	

The rest is 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

JS 6/15/2021

1- Khao Sam Roi Yot (WDPA ID 939) is reported as 2285 ha in the WDPA while in this submission it is reported as 13,567 ha of terrestrial area and 2,281 ha of marine area. Please confirm that these surface area are correct and that you will go through the process of correcting the corresponding WDPA entries during project implementation.

2- Same question for Kui Buri National Park(WDPA ID 312949): the surface area in the WDPA is 96,900 ha when it is reported as 99,518 ha in this submission. Please confirm that these surface area are correct and that you will go through the process of correcting the corresponding WDPA entries during project implementation.

3- Please add the baseline METT score for Khao Sam Roi Yot under core indicator 2 as well. As agreed at PIF stage, please use the same METT score for both marine and terrestrial part of the PA, i.e. conduct only one METT but report twice the score under core indicator 1 and 2:

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF) ⓘ	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at TE) ⓘ	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Khao Sam Roi Yot National Park	939	National Park	2,088.00	2,281.00					

4- The PIF-stage 1,000 ha target on core indicator 4.1 was a clear underestimate. While the project can likely not claim direct effect on practices over the full province, even if a provincial tourism masterplan will be developed, 17,208 ha still seems relatively low. Please clarify how the 17,208 ha target was derived (which specific project activities will target specifically these 17,208 ha but not the larger landscape?) and consider revising upward.

5- The Rio Marker for Mitigation has been set to 1 but there is no mitigation target (core indicator 6). Please provide a target on core indicator 6 and explain the methodology used.

Agency Response

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

JS 6/15/2021

1 - The CER portal entry states that output 1.5 is a new output when "1.5 Capacity development program for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation within tourism planning, development and operations institutionalized within key national and provincial government agencies." was already in the approved PIF. Please correct.

2- Please clarify why the barrier identified by STAP related to "entrenched economic self-interest of those who benefit from unsustainable tourism developments, and likely push-back against limitations on this" has not been explicitly added and how it will be addressed by the project.

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

JS 6/22/2021 -

1) The baseline analysis shows that the many overlapping tourism strategies/plans that exist in Thailand will all expire in either 2021 or 2022 (annex 11.c / section 5).

However, the baseline analysis is silent on the likely policy baseline during project implementation. What is foreseen for the next phase: revisions/updates of all these plans, development of a single overarching plan ?

2) We note Annex 11j provides some lessons learnt from international experience and annex 11.c some additional information on anticipated increments of a subset of the international projects listed in the baseline. However, the work of BIOFIN in Thailand is no longer mentioned, when the PIF stated it "provides an excellent opportunity for replication between the respective projects and this potential will be explored further during the PPG phase", and the CER mentions collaboration with BIOFIN. Please include BIOFIN in the baseline and its corresponding lessons learnt.

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

JS 6/22/2021

1) The ToC outlined in the PIF relied on two main complementary strategies: (i) developing "niche" BD-based tourism to demonstrate a new model in secondary destination that could help disburse overcrowding at other high-biodiversity tourism sites in a sustainable way, and (ii) "greening" tourism in general, including addressing unsustainable tourism. The CER, however, does not adequately present the project contribution to the second strategy. While we note the responses STAP and Council on related questions, the project's contribution to "greening" tourism in general, in particular to tackling unsustainable tourism, is not clearly articulated, especially as some related elements (e.g. former 2.3) seem to have been scaled back. Please clarify the description of the alternative scenario, and in particular the ToC and conceptual model, to make explicit the project's strategy, ambition and underlying interventions specifically dedicated to "greening" tourism in general, including tackling unsustainable tourism.

2) The ProDoc states, in the summary of the ToC, "In turn, the benefits will offset impacts of HWC and lead to reduced poaching." However, HWC and poaching are not explicitly mentioned in any outputs / outcomes or anywhere in the ToC diagram. Please

clarify the project contribution to HWC and poaching management or consider removing that sentence.

3) Component 1:

3.1: In relation to comment 1 of the previous comment box on expiring tourism plans / strategies, please further clarify in the CEO endorsement request how (i) the project will contribute to the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the successors of these expiring national tourism strategy(ies) / plan(s), and (ii) the additional strategy dedicated to biodiversity-based tourism the project will develop will articulate with these ?

3.2: Please clarify to what extent 1.2.1 (feasibility study for fee on PA entrance) and 1.2.2 (feasibility assessment on the potential to leverage conservation finance from the tourism sector) are not already/to be carried out by BIOFIN Thailand?

4) Component 2, output 2.3: We note the project will finance equipment and/or information technology for tourism enterprises (2.3.5) and "support them" to apply some standards (2.3.8).

4a- Please clarify if the latter also includes financial support and, more generally, if the project plans to support financially tourism enterprises, beyond equipment. If no financial support is to be directly provided by the project beyond the \$120,000 planned for equipment, please clarify why the provision of training, equipment and technical assistance, including assistance to access other funds (2.2.3), is considered sufficient.

4b- For equipment and any other direct financial support, please clarify what mechanism and criteria will be used to ensure fairness and transparency (e.g. competitive process ?), which organization will be responsible for it (who will decide on grant/equipment attribution and manage funds?), and how fiduciary standards will be duly enforced. Please also confirm that only community-based MSMEs will be directly supported.

5) Component 3: output 3.3 Please confirm that the collaboration with GWP on knowledge sharing, including the participation to GWP events, has been discussed and agreed with the GWP coordination teams.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/22/2021 -

1- Please see comment on the baseline and alternative scenario related to BIOFIN and clarify the increment of output 1.2 compared to work undertaken by BIOFIN.

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

JS 6/22/2021 - Cleared but see comment on core indicator targets.

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

JS 6/24/2021

1) Sustainability : Please clarify how the training and capacity building provided will be institutionalized and last beyond the project timeframe. While it is clear and well-thought for output 1.5, it is less clear for the other training / capacity building activities undertaken in the project (training on standards in output 1.4, support to PA staff and committees in output 2.1, "comprehensive knowledge, skills and training package on biodiversity-based tourism" of output 2.3, ICT/social media marketing training of 3.2).

Agency Response

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

JS 6/15/2021 - Yes, cleared.

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

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

JS 6/24/2021

1- Please tick the boxes in the portal entry:

2. Stakeholders ⓘ

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations ⓘ

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities ⓘ

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

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
JS 6/24/2021

1- We note the annexed Gender analysis and Gender Mainstreaming and Action Plan. The latter, however, contains many activities (25), with none explicitly linked to specific project outputs and some not reflected in the description of the alternative scenario (e.g. Activity 2.1 Organize a consultation/informative meeting on biodiversity- based tourism [...] does not seem to appear in component 2, or Activity 2.14 Develop education campaign targeting Gen Z and female tourists in both domestic and international tourists, when there does not seem to be campaign targeting tourists planned under component 2)

Please confirm that all these "gender-related" activities are to be carried out, link each of them to specific project outputs and ensure that all the corresponding project outputs and activities upon which these "gender-related activities" depend are duly integrated in the description of the alternative scenario.

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
JS 6/24/2021 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/24/2021

1- Risk 22 states "Private sector partnership risks, mitigation measures, and fuller detail of PTT are included in the UNDP's private sector due diligence package for PTT" but we failed to locate the private sector due diligence package. Please clarify where it is include in the CER package or upload it if it was not the case.

2- The Annex 14. COVID-19 analysis and action framework uploaded with this submission contains tracked changes. Please upload a final version of this annex with the resubmission.

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

JS 6/24/2021

1- Please explain why this project entirely dedicated to the tourism sector is not at least co-executed by the MOTS or one of its agencies.

2- Please use GEF terminology in the portal entry (implementing agency for UNDP / executing agency for BEDO).

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

JS 6/24/2021 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/24/2021 -

Please correct the typo:

- Sharing knowledge generated by the project between project sites at PTPC, the Provincial Project Working Group entrepreneurs and communities. The **UNDP PRODOC Annex 2: Multi Year Work Plan** provides:

The work plan is annex 3.

The rest is cleared.

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

JS 6/24/2021 - We note the project is rated "moderate" overall and note the attached Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) . We also note that two Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), additional SESP screening at site-level, a Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), and FPIC processes are planned to mitigate potential impacts during implementation, and that the need for an Environmental and Social Management Framework will be decided depending on the SESA.

1- Please explain why, a part from the SESA that is planned as part of output 2.1 and is thus meant to be carried out during project implementation, these additional assessments and plans were not carried out during PPG.

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
JS 6/24/2021

1- Current M&E budget represents 5.24% of the GEF-funded part of project financing, which is above the typical 5% observed in the GEF portfolio for project of this size. Please revise to 5% (\$125, 701) or under, or justify thoroughly why this project needs a bigger than typical M&E budget.

2- Please correct the typo in the portal entry. The monitoring plan is annex 4, not 3.

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
JS 6/24/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 6/24/2021

The audit template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

1 Budget:

We note that project staff are also charged on components but that PMC is exhausted and adequate terms of reference are provided in annex 7 of the ProDoc.

1a: Please clarify more precisely what type of equipment and vehicles are to be purchased under the budget line "Finance equipment, vehicles and/or information technology required to improve the quality of the biodiversity-based tourism enterprises under Output 2.3 (3 years * \$40,000 = \$120,000)". As the agency knows, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Please thus justify thoroughly why the purchase of vehicles is necessary and why, if the recipients are indeed tourism enterprises, vehicles are to be granted with GEF funding instead of using other financial tools or sources (e.g. commercial micro-loans).

1b: There are several budget lines that include support to PTT Plc's Sirinart Rajini Ecosystem Learning Center, which, as we understand it, is led by the private sector. Please explain the status of this learning center and this planned support when there is no co-financing from PTT reported.

Agency Response **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 6/24/2021 - Cleared but see comment on target for core indicator 4.1.

Agency Response **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 6/24/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response **Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 6/24/2021 - See comment 1 on alternative scenario and project contribution to "greening" tourism in general. Once addressed, please revise accordingly the response to Germany.

Agency Response **STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/15/2021 -

1- The following response is not clear, please clarify what the project will do beyond "improved management" if it is only it "only one aspect of the complete solution".

<p><u>Outcomes</u></p> <p>-</p> <p>"Note, however, that improved management doesn't equate to improved biodiversity status - the proposal makes clear that expansion of tourism in this area is foreseen, and it is unclear whether the status of biodiversity is expected to improve, or just that the management of the impacts of tourism will improve, making the habitat loss and other impacts of this tourist expansion less damaging than they otherwise would be."</p>	<p>As the expansion of tourism is foreseen, the improved management is only one aspect of the complete solution to ensure that biodiversity conservation is an integral part of the tourism development planning and operation. Improved management that partly entails capacity building and awareness raising will make sure that the responsible personnel are adept in biodiversity conservation. This includes – being able to assess changes in biodiversity indicators in the project landscape (e.g. presence of fishing cat and waterbird species); developing mitigation measures during planning; and exploring and advancing opportunities to improve biodiversity status including biodiversity financing options.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>CEO ER Annex A</p> <p>UNDP PRODOC Section V Project Results Framework indicators for Outcome 2, Indicator 3 on fishing cat and waterbird indicators, coupled with the UNDP PRODOC Annex 4 on monitoring changes.</p>
---	---	--

2- In the response to STAP's comment on local communities participation in the tourism platform to be established, please clarify how the project will "enable local communities or their organizations to have direct representation in the platform":

<p>"In component 2, part of the aim seems to be to increase benefits from tourism to local communities, but they (or their representative orgs) don't seem to be included in the tourism platform to be established".</p>	<p>The rationale is that the community organizations and community-based tourism providers will be members of the Tourism Association (TA) and will be represented in the platform through the TA. However, tourism related businesses organizations tend to have overrepresentation in TAs, thus, local communities' interests could be underrepresented in the TA agenda. Therefore, it is a better approach for the local communities or their organizations to have direct representation in the platform, which this project will enable.</p> <p>Tourism associations participating in the project include the Thai Responsible Tourism Association (TRTA), Ecotourism and Adventure Tourism Association (TEATA), Thailand Community Based Tourism Institute Foundation (TCBTIF), Protected Area Committees (PAC) of Kui Buri National Park, Khao Sam Roi Yot National park, and Pran Buri, Tourism Association of Prachuap Khiri Khan (TAP), Prachuap Khiri Khan Community-Based Tourism Association (CBTA)</p>	<p>CEO ER Output 1.5, Table: Responsibilities of key stakeholders in the implementation of the project</p> <p>UNDP PRODOC Section V Policy and management arrangements describes the role of tourism as a priority in the project (Table 16), and participation in the existing Provincial Policy Committee, the Provincial Project Working Group, and inclusion as Beneficiary representative (Figure 5).</p> <p>Their role as stakeholders is elaborated in UNDP PRODOC Stakeholder engagement plan</p>
---	--	---

3-Please correct what appears to be an unintentional addition in the following response to STAP (see highlighted):

This is also reflected in the Theory of Change assumptions in the UNDP PROD OC Table 8: see A1: "There is political and institutional support for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into tourism development, for improving coordination, and for reducing threats to biodiversity from the impacts of unsustainable tourism. This could have a sentence added to the Notes and References column to say that this political and institutional support would carry through to implementing and enforcing new policies."

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 Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 6/15/2021 - Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/24/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above sheet and resubmit.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

6/24/2021

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations