

Strengthening capacity in the energy, agriculture, forestry and other land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in the implementation and monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10156

Countries

Benin

Project Name

Strengthening capacity in the energy, agriculture, forestry and other land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in the implementation and monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/22/2020

Review completed by PM

3/25/2021

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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

November 23, 2020:

Yes, the CEO endorsement request remains in line with the elements presented in the PIF. In the table under "Focal Area Outcomes" please write the full name of the focal area element: "Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies through the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency".

March 24, 2021:

The comment made is not addressed but it was for clarification purpose and not a condition for clearance. 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
November 23, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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
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
November 23, 2020:

1. In Table C, the in-kind co-financing from FAO is reported to be \$250,000 while the corresponding support letter says it is \$100,000. Please correct as needed so that the information provided is consistent throughout the package (including in Table B and C).

2. The co-financing letter from the Government is in French and doesn't specify whether the support will be in-kind or as grant. Please provide a translation in English specifying what kind of support is expected.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and the English translation of the co-financing letter from the Government. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Please, note that there are several co-financing letters from FAO, for an overall total of USD 250,000 in-kind and an additional USD 200,000 grant from FAO/NDC-P/WRI. The 3 different sources from within FAO have been captured in 3 complementary letters.

2. An informal translation has been provided. The co-financing from the Ministry is a modest in-kind contribution to the project.

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

November 23, 2020:

Yes, the project adopts a cost-effective approach that builds on other enabling activities.

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

November 23, 2020:

Yes, the status and utilization of the PPG is reported in Annex C, including \$37,600 spent and \$12,400 committed.

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

November 23, 2020:

The core indicator targets remain the same as submitted in the PIF and are realistic.
Cleared.

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

November 23, 2020:

1. There is a typo error in the title of table 6 "MNV systems". Please correct.
2. The Figure 1 "MRV System Proposed by Benin" seems incomplete in the Prodoc (the right part is cut by the edge of the page). Please ensure the figure provided is complete.
3. Both tables 7 and 8 identify capacity needs/gaps and it is unclear how they are related (what does the left column of table 8 mean?). For a better clarity on the identified priorities that need to be addressed, please provide one unique table including clearly all the identified needs/gaps.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Typo in the title of table 6 "MNV systems" has now been corrected.
2. Figure 1 "MRV System Proposed by Benin" has now been fixed (table now fully visible)
3. Left column in Table 8 just indicates the priority actions grouped by source

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 23, 2020:

The co-financing letter from FAO of \$200,000 as grant refers to the CAEP of the NDC Partnership. Nevertheless, this project and the NDC Partnership are not mentioned in the proposal. Please clarify in the baseline scenario what is being done in the country through the NDC Partnership and explain in the alternative scenario under section 3 and in the incremental reasoning under section 5 how the CBIT project articulates with this baseline in particular.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response Baseline scenario (section 2) and alternative scenario (section 3) have now been integrated with fairly detailed information on NDC-P and CAEP funds which were strategically attracted during PPG phase for synergy with the forthcoming CBIT Benin project.

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

November 23, 2020:

1. For a better clarity on how the proposed activities are expected to achieve the project objectives/results, please provide a clear Theory of Change that articulates causes and barriers, interventions and expected outcomes in the Portal.

2. In general, we note the text provided to describe the components seems to be exactly the same as the one at PIF stage. It is expected that the PPG phase allow to further develop, adapt and refine as needed the alternative scenario presented at PIF stage. As a result, there is relatively little detail provided for each of the outputs (such as for instance the coordination mechanism, what it would aim to achieve concretely).

Building on the activities listed in Table 9, please elaborate further the description of the components explaining with more details the activities and outputs, including their respective link with the identified baseline.

3. We note outputs are formulated differently in the components description and in the table 9. Please ensure the text is the same in the components description and in table 9.

4. Under Output 1.1 it is not clear how the CBIT project specifically will learn from previous experiences and how its strategy is different from what has been employed before. Please clarify.

5. Output 1.2 mentions the establishment of a national best practices database. However, the project results framework indicates that this will comprise of ?at least? five. Please clarify the vision for this database and how it may be used, and by whom.

6. Under Outcome 2.1, the description mentions MRV tools that will be developed under the FAO CBIT-AFOLU global project. Please consider the other CBIT projects, especially taking into account this project also includes the energy sector.

March 24, 2021:

1. Thank you for providing the TOC. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the clarification and complements. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.
- 4 and 5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
6. Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. A clear theory of change has been produced and uploaded in the Portal.
2. Description of the components in the ProDoc is mostly unchanged from the PIF as the latter was designed based on direct experience of FAO in the country on specific GHGI issues (QA of BUR and data management workshops in 2018, described in the document) and in close contact with national GHG inventory experts. Nevertheless, description has now been enriched with some additional information, as requested.
3. Components and outputs description were corrected in the text and in Table 9.
4. We trust the comment refers to Outcome 1.1. :
The strategy behind this Outcome is to ?pave the way? to the establishment of ETF-compliant institutional arrangements, updating the stock take on current institutional and capacity gaps, while building upon parallel efforts and programs mentioned in the document. Differently from other internationally funded initiatives, however, the CBIT project will be executed directly by the country institutions responsible for ETF and UNFCCC reporting (OPA modality, in FAO terminology), which should guarantee best tailoring of the proposed roadmaps and plans to the actual institutional needs. Furthermore, by targeting the institutional arrangements first (which should hopefully achieve an institutionalization of functional posts and collaboration mechanisms), the

subsequent capacity building activities planned under the remaining Outcomes can target specific staff, reducing the risk of training temporary personnel subject to high turnover.

5. We believe the comment refers to Outcome 1.2. :

Among others, this Outcome supports the establishment of a national knowledge base of best practices for data and information collection. This is in response to some of the findings of the Quality Assurance process (delivered by UNFCCC in collaboration with FAO in 2018) which highlighted a significant deficit in data availability (collection) for some key categories within the AFOLU and energy (transport) sectors and which in turn hinders the application of higher tiers methodology recommended by the IPCC Guidelines. Therefore, this outcome targets data providers (as they will have to collect the data currently unavailable or insufficiently disaggregated) in close collaboration with the GHGI data compilers, who will flag them any additional inventory data needs.

6. Description of Outcome 2.1 has been updated to include any possible MRV tool that may be developed under other CBIT projects.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 23, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 23, 2020:

There is no mention of the coordination and implementation arrangements. Please elaborate on how the additional support from the the GEF will build on the exiting baseline and allow the achievement of the objectives sought through Component 1.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Please, consider paragraph 163 in section 6.b which elaborates how the GEF project will coordinate efforts with ongoing investments, including particularly the baseline investments mobilised as co-finance.

Furthermore, do consider elements of response provided under Component's 1 description and even further under the 'sustainability' section. An additional paragraph (no.93) has been added to elaborate more on coordination and implementation arrangements.

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

November 23, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

November 23, 2020:

Please also consider the role of Benin as an LDC and the role it may play in scaling up across the African region.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response A specific sentence on LDC has been added to paragraph 119.

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

November 23, 2020:

Yes, the project covers all the national territory. 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
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
November 23, 2020:

1. The list of participants of the consultation workshop is missing in Annex M of the Prodoc. Please complete.
2. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been submitted in Annex N of the Prodoc. The description says under the private sector section: "Collaboration with private entities such as international research groups and/or agencies, is envisaged in the proposed CBIT as a means to facilitate data collection as well as the assessment and dissemination of best practices in ETF reporting. Collaboration with local producers, as well as other national entities relevant to the energy and AFOLU sectors will also be established to perform the stocktaking of the existing activities and systems; identify and test possible adaptation indicators in the energy and AFOLU sectors; as well as for disseminating lessons learned on transparency, with a specific attention to gender issues." Nevertheless, in the Portal and in this Prodoc, the engagement of the private sector remains unclear and poorly described. In addition, the Table 14 of the engagement plan "Identified stakeholders during PPG" doesn't mention any entity of the private sector. Please complete accordingly and consider a broader subset of private sector such as

leading agribusinesses from cotton, palm oil, energy and transportation sector. Please also consider the involvement of gender-related organizations and other NGOs.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the complements. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The list was removed as it is a scanned document (very heavy). It has now been restored in its position.

2. Table 19 in Chapter 2. Stakeholders has been revised as requested.

Chapter 4. Private Sector Engagement has been completely overhauled.

Correspondingly, Table 14 of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been integrated with other relevant stakeholders.

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

November 23, 2020:

On the Gender Action Plan (Annex P), we note the breakdown of planned activities, indicators/targets and budget. Please clarify the following:

1. We note that several indicators/targets relate to participation of women. Please also consider indicators that may be more meaningful such as % of participation of women from higher levels of government, number of women trained and are considered experts, number of women and men (separately) whose knowledge/understanding of gender mainstreaming in GHG and MRV systems can increase.

2. Activity 1.1.3 proposes and implements a gender action plan in each sector: It is not clear if this gender action plan is only for Component 1 (institutional arrangements for coordination). If so, what does the plan aim to achieve considering that, based on some of the other listed activities under this component, it seems that communication and awareness are already built in. Please provide clarity.

3. Activity 1.1.5 puts in place the legal arrangements for the establishment of the mechanism: Indicator for this is 30% of women represented. It is unclear what this means in the context of the activity and/or result. Please clarify.

4. Related to the above, provide explanation if a gender-related organization will be somehow included in the stakeholder engagement to ensure smooth implementation of the Gender Action Plan and identification of gender gaps.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and complements. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The Gender Action Plan has been completely overhauled, including on the choice of indicators, which we hope make now more sense. Only one plan is foreseen with gender-related activities disaggregated into the three project components and closely interlinked with them.

2. Idem

3. Idem

4. Paragraph 141 has been introduced to explain project contribution in addressing gender equality and paragraph 142 has been modified to include participation of NGOs (some examples are given therein) which may be called to collaborate to develop and implement gender-related activities

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

November 23, 2020:

As mentioned under the Stakeholder section above, consider including key businesses, especially from the energy and AFOLU sector, and explain what will be their role.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Please, see the response in the Stakeholders section above.

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

November 23, 2020:

1. The continuous evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic and its already observed and potential consequences on project design and implementation unfortunately obliges us now to consider this important risk too. Some risk and opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. Please further consider the risk analysis and eventual opportunities this project could provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (it can be a specific note after the risk table under the risk section of the CEO endorsement request). For further clarification and possible guidance, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the additional input. The opportunity analysis doesn't appear clearly captured and will need to be fully considered during implementation. Cleared.

Agency Response The risks from the Covid-19 pandemic have been integrated in the risk log. A short description of the potentials of the project to enhance resilience of the beneficiaries against future pandemics has been added under the risk log as suggested.

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

November 23, 2020:

1. The description says "The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) will be the GEF executing agency for the project, ...", "As the executing agency of the GEF" ... Please note that as implementing agency, FAO can't be executing agency. Please correct as needed.

2. In addition, we learn that "FAO retains responsibility and grant funds for the procurement of IT equipment and IT services..."; and "In light of its recognized capacity

and multiannual experience in the sector, FAO will also provide the project with guidance and technical assistance in the area of transparency in the AFOLU domain, retaining part of the grant...". Please note that as implementing agency, FAO can't execute project activities using GEF grant in the project budget. Please correct as needed.

3. If the project requires FAO to execute some particular functions, a letter from the Government needs to be provided to officially request the support of FAO to execute these functions. Please consider the template on GEF website for IA executing function exception requests <https://www.thegef.org/documents/templates> (see OFP letter of support).

4. For the budget, we expect now that agencies provide us with a standard format version in the portal, which is provided in the policy guidelines update in Appendix A (see link below), where Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) is clearly identified. Please provide such a budget table.

<https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

5. This CBIT project will coordinate with already existing initiatives to build on each other's work and prevent duplication of efforts. Please elaborate further on how this coordination will be conducted and managed. For example, will the leads of the various activities regularly inform each other of their progress and gaps?

March 24, 2021:

1. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.
- 2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification and amendments. We note that the cost of the executing functions handled by the GEF Agency represents around 19% of the project budget. While this appears relatively high, it is justified by FAO due to a lack of minimum fiduciary standards for procurement of the national Executing Agency and confirmed by the OFP. Cleared in the sake of project efficiency.
4. Thank you for providing the budget table. Cleared.
5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. ?Executing? has been substituted with ?implementing?. This was incorrect.
2. Direct involvement of FAO in project execution has been modified. See also answer to question 3 in this section.
3. A signed letter, using the recommended template, has been uploaded in the Portal. It details the services that will be provided by FAO. The reason why FAO is providing these services is that the executing partner MCVDD did not meet the minimum fiduciary standards for procurement (independent HACT micro-assessment conducted).

Consequently, FAO will provide the procurement services in the context of this project. The other voices within the PMC reflect the cost related to the management of the operational partner agreement (audits and spot checks) and the evaluation provisions, as always conducted by FAOs OED. All these services have been discussed with and agreed upon by the MCVDD and the GEF OFP in Benin.

4. Please, see the attached budget which specifies the portion of the budget per each single involved partner. The template used for the budget is the latest approved template.

5. New paragraph added (no.163).

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
November 23, 2020:

Please also mention Benin's NDC in this section.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Please, note that NDC was already mentioned. However, more specific information has been added in table 13.

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
November 23, 2020:

Please elaborate further on the Knowledge Management (KM) Approach providing a budget, timeline and specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables. Also include plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives etc. and explain how the KM Approach will contribute to the project's overall impact.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response Please, consider the amendments proposed in the Knowledge Management Approach Section.

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
November 23, 2020:

Yes, the ESS certification confirms that the risk is low. Cleared.

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
November 23, 2020:

1. The total amount of the budget for M&E is different in the uploaded budget table (\$56,500) and in the project description in the Portal (\$142,000). Please correct and ensure the information provided is consistent.
2. In the project description in the Portal, the budget for the project coordinator's annual travels appear very high, especially for national travels to implement M&E activities. Please explain and revise as needed.

March 24, 2021:

1 and 2. Thank you for the corrections. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The inconsistency has been corrected. This inconsistency was the result of an erroneous travel cost entry.

2. Apologies. The cost of travel under M&E was a typo. The annual cost is USD3 500, which amounts to USD 10 500 for the life of the project. The M&E costing table has been updated.

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
November 23, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 23, 2020:

The Annex G: GEF Project Taxonomy Worksheet is missing. Please complete as needed.

March 24, 2021:

Thank you for uploading the Taxonomy worksheet. Cleared.

Agency Response The worksheet is there now.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 23, 2020:

1. We note the use of quantitative targets for the project results framework. However, we would like to encourage more ambitious targets than have been proposed. For

example, number of improved procedures has 1 for mid-term and at least 2 for final objective.

2. For output 1.1.4 please clarify and provide rationale for which institutions would be included in the ?? and ?? for a national coordination mechanism.

3. Output 1.2.3 - please clarify what is meant by number of interconnected nodes.

4. Output 2.1.2 ? number of emission factors developed: the target remains the same for both mid-term and final. Please explain and revise if needed.

March 24, 2021:

1. Thank you for clarifying and raising the ambition. Cleared.
- 2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
4. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Ambition raised by 1 (the procedures to be improved are essentially three: documentation, archiving and QA/QC protocols;)
2. Output 1.1.4 amended with required information
3. Output 1.2.3 amended with required explanatory information
4. Revised. However, the development of emission factors is particularly resources intensive (financially and timewise) and while the process may start during the project, its completion may well go beyond its duration.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

November 23, 2020:

The status and utilization of the PPG is reported in Annex C, including \$37,600 spent and \$12,400 committed.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 23, 2020:

Yes, the project covers all the national territory. 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?

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.

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?

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
November 23, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above. In doing so, please also upload a version of the CEO ER with the changes highlighted in yellow to facilitate the review process.

March 28, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the following comments:

1. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 8.5%, for a co-financing of \$460,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$39,100 instead of \$0 (which is 0%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and eventually by reducing the GEF portion.

2. Gender: It is well noted that additional work has been made to improve the Gender Action Plan. The plan outlines actions as well as indicators and targets across the 3 project components. It seems, however, that the gender action plan has been developed without being informed by a gender analysis. While, it understandable that this kind of project does not lend itself to prepare a full scale gender analysis prior to implementation, please better describe what kind of analysis was conducted prior to submission or to provide a justification why this has not be done. Linked to the lack of gender analysis, are the various targets set out in the action plan, including for example one target that says "At least 30% of women represented" in activity related to "Exchange information on the lessons learned by stakeholders in the implementation of the project with a view to adopting a new policy to combat gender inequalities?". Considering that the estimated number of direct beneficiaries (Core indicator 11) are only 100 (50/50 men and women), it is unclear why the gender plan include so low targets for women's participation and representation. Please clarify further.

3. Budget table: Admin/finance manager should usually be charged under PMC but not under project components as currently shown in the budget table. Please amend accordingly.

March 29, 2021:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO approval is now recommended.

4.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | 11/23/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/28/2021 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/29/2021 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations