



# Enduring Earth: Accelerating Sustainable Finance Solutions to Achieve Durable Conservation

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11014

**Countries**

Regional

**Project Name**

Enduring Earth: Accelerating Sustainable Finance Solutions to Achieve Durable Conservation

**Agencies**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

7/15/2023

**Review completed by PM**

10/2/2023

**Program Manager**

Adriana Moreira

**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**

7-18-23: The project remains well aligned with the BD focal area priorities (BD 2.7 Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate).

**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 7-18-23:** Project structure proposed in Table B is adequate to achieve proposed outcomes.

**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 7-18-23: Proposed co-financing is adequate. Please, attach co-financing letters to table C

## Agency Response

09/12/23

Co-financing letters have been attached to Table C as requested. These letters have been updated to reflect additional investment mobilized by WWF, TNC, and the Pew Charitable Trusts.

## 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

8-10-23: Project Management Costs (PMC): the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$94,246,411 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$4,712,320 instead of \$2,716,293 (which is 2.8%).

Sub Total (\$)	21,557,886.00	94,246,411.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ		
GET	1,077,894.00	2,716,293.00
Sub Total(\$)	1,077,894.00	2,716,293.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	22,635,780.00	96,962,704.00

## Agency Response

09/28/23

The co-financing contribution to PMC has been increased by \$1,996,027 so that it now amounts to 5% of total co-financing, or \$4,712,320. Revised co-financing letters have been submitted by the Pew Charitable Trusts, The Nature Conservancy, and the World Wildlife Fund to reflect additional co-financing (as investment mobilized) to the project, in the amounts of US\$65,000, \$500,000, and \$1,431,027, respectively. Table B has been revised to reflect these adjusted values as have other references to co-financing for project management costs in the project document. Co-financing totals have been adjusted in the following places: all relevant sections of the CEO Endorsement Request; the prodoc cover sheet; Prodoc Sections 2.2 "Project Description ? Summary"; and Prodoc Section 2.8 "Budget," in the table describing sources and amounts of co-financing. Updates appear in red.

#### 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

8-10-23: The guidelines indicate that detailed information on the activities funded through the PPG should be provided in Annex C, instead of mentioning broad categories such as staff, consultants or due diligence, as presented. Please, revise accordingly.

#### ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED	GETF/LDCF/SCCF AMOUNT (\$)		
	BUDGETED AMOUNT	AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE	AMOUNT COMMITTED
GENDER ANALYSIS	36,798		36,798
SAFEGUARDS ANALYSIS	49,298	18,860	30,438
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	39,585	17,834	21,751
VALIDATION WORKSHOP	4,750		4,750
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT			-
CONSULTANTS	72,322	14,916	57,406
STAFF	68,647		68,647
TRAVEL	3,600		3,600
DUE DILIGENCE NAMIBIA FUND ADMINISTRATOR	25,000		25,000
TOTAL	300,000	51,610	248,390

10-5-23: The status of the utilization of the PPG is not adequately reported in Portal. The previous request was for detailed information on the activities funded through the PPG instead of mentioning broad categories such as staff, project development or due diligence

Namibia Fund Administrator ? this last category sounds as an administrative cost, which cannot be financed by GEF funds.

Additionally, the sum of some rows and columns are incorrect (see i, ii, iii and iv below).

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).** (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Gender Analysis	6,798		6,798
Safeguards Analysis	9,298	8,860	0,438
Stakeholder Engagement	39,585	17,834	1,751
Validation Workshop	4,750		4,750
Project Development	144,569	14,916	129,65
Due Diligence Namibia Fund Administrator	25,000		5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>51,610</b>	<b>48,390</b>

Agency Response

10/23/23

The calculations are correct. We have always reported the Amount Committed (C.) is the Budget Amount (A.) minus the Amount Spent to Date (B). If this is now somehow incorrect, please let us know, but assuming this is correct, then the calculations are correct. The Capacity Assessment of the Namibia Conservation Trust Fund is necessary to ensure that the chosen entity has the relevant expertise and capacity to ensure appropriate stewardship of the GEF Funding. The description of the activity has been adjusted in the PPG Utilization Report to clarify that it is not an administrative cost.

09/12/23

The PPG utilization report has been revised in response to this comment to present a more detailed statement of activities funded through the PPG. Funded activities include: a gender analysis (Gabon), safeguards analysis (Gabon), stakeholder engagement (Gabon), validation

workshop (Gabon), project development (consultant for the global project), and the completion of due diligence review of a potential fund administrator in Namibia.

#### **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**

8-8-23: Please, provide an explanation for the reduction on Indicator 4.1 area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity, from 516,000 ha at PIF stage to 0 ha at CEO endorsement stage.

Please consider including the core indicator 1 explicitly in the annex 1. The core indicator 1.2 should be mentioned in the results framework (annex a)

The targets for core indicators 6 and 11 are not consistent between core indicator table and results framework. please revise accordingly.

On Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment. The number of beneficiaries was not disaggregated by sex. Please, disaggregate as required.

10-5-23: The Portal version does not reflect Core Indicator 11 disaggregated by sex. Please revise to correspond to the Prodoc.

Please mention the indicator and target for Core indicator 1.2 explicitly in the results framework (annex a).

Please mention the indicator and target for Core indicator 6.2 explicitly in the results framework (annex a).

#### **Agency Response**

10/05/23

We have identified what appears to be an issue within the portal, as it does not accurately display the disaggregation of Core Indicator 11 by gender. To align with the Prodoc, we have attached a screenshot that clearly depicts Core Indicator 11 disaggregated by sex. Please review the attached image for reference.

The screenshot shows a web interface titled "Core Indicators at CEO Endorsement (CEO)". Inside, there's a section for "Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments". Below this is a table with four columns: "Number (Expected at PIF)", "Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)", "Number (Achieved at MTR)", and "Number (Achieved at TE)". The table has three rows: "Female", "Male", and "Total". The "Female" and "Male" rows have input fields for the "Expected at CEO Endorsement" column, both containing the value "149,351". The "Total" row shows "527802" for the PIF expected, "298702" for the CEO expected, and "0" for both MTR and TE achieved. At the bottom, there are buttons for "Back", "Save", and "Cancel".

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	263,901	149,351		
Male	263,901	149,351		
Total	527802	298702	0	0

**Core Indicator 1.2** is the third indicator listed in the project's results framework, which includes targets for both countries. Please review Annex A and also review the updated Annexes uploaded to the roadmap, which includes the Results Framework.

With respect to **Core Indicator 6.2**, the Results framework includes the direct GHG emission mitigation targets and also notes the indirect targets. There are no targets for GHG mitigation outside of the AFOLU sector.

09/12/23

a. Reduction on Indicator 4.1. The 516,000 HA included in the Core Indicator Worksheet under Core Indicator 4.1 in the PIF referred to community managed forests in Gabon, which, at the time of PIF submission, were expected to benefit directly from project interventions designed to improve management practices and yield positive biodiversity outcomes. Following stakeholder consultations at the first project design workshop (October 2022), it was agreed to focus project resources on the protected areas system in Gabon, given the availability of other financial resources for community managed forests. For this reason,

the referenced 516,000 HA were removed from the core indicator worksheet. Although improved management practices benefitting biodiversity in these community managed forests will not be tracked under the project, the forestry sector and communities in these areas will benefit through organizational/institutional capacity strengthening and support for enabling environments (e.g., policies and sustainable finance) financed by the project. b. Core Indicator 1.2. Annex 5 (Results Framework) includes targets for Core Indicator 1.2. c. Targets for Core Indicators 6 and 11. The Year 6 target for Namibia for Core Indicator 6 in the project results framework was incorrect/not aligned with the Core Indicator worksheet. This has been corrected. The updated figure appears in red. For Core Indicator 11, the figures have been disaggregated as required further to the comment received. The updated figures appear in red text. All portal entries concerning core indicators have been double checked to ensure alignment with the contents of the results framework and with the project document.

## **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

7-19-23: Barriers and threats are adequately described and substantiated by data and references.

### 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

7-19-23: Baseline scenario and associated projects are well described.

### 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

7-19-23: Alternative scenarios are adequately described

### 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

7-21-23: Alignment with focal area strategy is well elaborated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7-21-23: Incremental cost reasoning is adequate.

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

7-21-23: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily in relation to better elaboration of the expected contributions to GEBs and adaptation benefits.

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

7-21-23: Description of potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up is adequate

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

8-8-23: In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

Agency Response

9/28/23

The PFPs in Namibia and Gabon are national in scope. The coordinates for individual PAs and conservancies receiving support will be added during implementation. The work in ETP is focused on the design of a PFP/governance mechanism (there are no sites), and so the coordinates for the capital cities of the four countries has been added.

#### **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

7-24-23: Stakeholder engagement strategy is satisfactory.

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

8-8-23: Please, include plans and budget for reporting on the Gender Action Plan.

10-5-23: The Portal version does not reflect Core Indicator 11 disaggregated by sex. Please revise to correspond to the Prodoc.

Please reflect in the section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in the Portal the sentence [Agency response in the Review Sheet) on monitoring and reporting on the GAP:

*The M&E plan for the project includes monitoring and reporting on the GAP. GAP-specific indicators will be incorporated in output and activity level indicators and targets in the AWPB as set at the end of each project year for the following year?.*

## Agency Response

10/23/23

We have identified an issue with the display of Core Indicator 11 in the portal, as it currently shows disaggregated data. In response, we have incorporated the provided response in the In the section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment section of the Portal we have incorporated the proposed text.

09/28/23

Prodoc sections 2.5.2 (?Gender Action Plan for Project Execution?) and 2.3.2.1 (?Institutional Arrangements?) as well as the GAPs themselves describe plans for monitoring and reporting of progress with respect to the gender action plan for each geography. These are summarized below.

The M&E plan for the project includes monitoring and reporting on the GAP. GAP-specific indicators will be incorporated in output and activity level indicators and targets in the AWPB as set at the end of each project year for the following year. Also, the results framework contains GEF core indicator 11, which will track the number of project beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender).

Part of the global PMU staff responsibility will be to provide capacity and report on implementation of the GAPs across the entire project. Prior to PFP single close, co-financing will cover the costs of GAP implementation in Gabon and Namibia under project Component 1. The project includes budget for CTF staff time to implement the GAPs and do direct monitoring and reporting in Namibia and Gabon on indicators included in the GAP (and in the AWPB) post-PFP closing. Furthermore, the gender inclusive approach outlined in the GAPs for Gabon and Namibia will be integrated into the PFP development and operations and will apply to GEF and all other sources of funding managed by the CTF/Fund Manager under the PFP. Under Component 2, the sub-grant to Pew will cover the costs of implementation and monitoring of the GAP.

In the ProDoc's gender section (Section 2.5.2), the appropriate section of the CER, and the gender action plans, a note has been added (in red text) to clarify budget available for GAP implementation/monitoring and reporting.

The GAP in Gabon has been streamlined and edited for clarity and to address the points raised in this review and to ensure integration with overall project budget.

#### **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**

7-24-23: Private sector engagement approach is consistent with proposed project objectives.

#### **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**

7-24-23: Description of risks and mitigation is adequate.

#### **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**

7-24-23: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear indication of roles and responsibilities. The proposed public-private partnership mechanisms are well described and builds up from previous experiences.

#### **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

7-24-23: Proposed project is well aligned with both country's national strategies and will directly contribute to the GBF targets.

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

7-25-23: The proposed knowledge management approach is adequate.

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

7-25-23: The environmental and social safeguards are well documented and consistent with guidelines.

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

7-25-23: Project includes adequate M&E plan with specific budget.

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

7-25-23: Socioeconomic benefits are well described.

Agency Response

## **Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-10-23: The budget table provided in Annex E is missing the column with the expenditure category and the detailed description of the funded activities for each component. As is we are not able to review the budget. Please, review the template of the budget provided in the guidelines of the project cycle (screenshot 2 below) and reupload a budget table with the detailed description of each activity. It is also requested to have a separate column for the M&E activities. Once resubmitted we will be able to review and provide comments on the budget.

# ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Budget notes and assumptions # (Please include footnotes below)							Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
	TOTAL COMPONENT 1	TOTAL COMPONENT 2	TOTAL COMPONENT 3	Subtotal	PMC	Total Project	
1	5,000,000	-	-	5,000,000		5,000,000	Gabon CTF
2	401,385	-	172,000	573,385		573,385	TNC
3	8,700,000	-	-	8,700,000		8,700,000	Namibia Fund Administrator
4	-	1,199,464	-	1,199,464		1,199,464	TNC
5	3,465,558	-	224,000	3,689,558		3,689,558	TNC
6	-	400,000	-	400,000		400,000	TNC
	-	-	-	-		-	
	17,566,943	1,599,464	396,000	19,562,407	-	19,562,407	
7	280,410		-	280,410		280,410	TNC
8	100,000		-	100,000		100,000	TNC
	380,410		-	380,410	-	380,410	

## Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)									Total (USD eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) <sup>10</sup>
		Component 1		Component 2		Component 3		Sub-Total	M & E	P M C		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2					
Works	...											
	...											
Goods	Equipment 1											e.g. Ministry of Environment
	Equipment 2											
	...											
Vehicles						xxx			xx x			
Grants/ Sub-grants	...											
Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	...											
Sub-contract to executing partner/ entity												
Contractual Services – Individual	...											
Contractual Services – Company	...											
International Consultants	Int'l consultant 1	xxx										
	Int'l consultant 2			xxx								

10-5-23: Budget table: the column ?expenditure category? is still missing. Please, review the template of the budget provided in the guidelines of the project cycle (screenshot below) and reupload a budget table with the detailed description of each activity. It is also requested to have a separate column for the M&E activities. Once resubmitted we will be able to review and provide comments on the budget.



## ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Budget notes and assumptions # (Please include footnotes below)	Component 1: Deploying Project Finance for Permanence (PFP) for priority conservation areas in Gabon and Namibia TOTAL COMPONENT 1	Component 2: Global support to scale out PFP TOTAL COMPONENT 2	Component 3: Monitoring & Evaluation and Knowledge Management TOTAL COMPONENT 3	Subtotal	PMC	Total Project	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)(1)
1	5,000,000	-	-	5,000,000		5,000,000	Gabon CTF
2	401,385	-	172,000	573,385		573,385	TNC
3	8,700,000	-	-	8,700,000		8,700,000	Namibia Fund Administrator
4	-	1,199,464	-	1,199,464		1,199,464	TNC
5	3,465,558	-	224,000	3,689,558		3,689,558	TNC
6	-	400,000	-	400,000		400,000	TNC
	-	-	-	-		-	
	17,566,943	1,599,464	396,000	19,562,407	-	19,562,407	

### Agency Response

10/05/23

We have recognized an issue with the presentation of the budget, particularly the absence of the 'expenditure category' column. In response, we have updated the image and provided a comprehensive, detailed budget as a separate document. This revised version now includes a dedicated column for M&E activities.

09/12/23

The budget has been uploaded to the "Roadmap" in the portal as an Excel file. This file includes columns on expenditure category and a detailed description of activities funded. M&E is the focus of Component 3 of the project, which is captured in the referenced

Excel file. Also, we have uploaded in the portal CER a screenshot of the summary of the budget.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-8-23: Please, see comments above on core indicators and results framework.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-11-23: Please, respond to comments above and resubmit for review. Thanks!

10-5-23: Please, there are still some comments above that need to be addressed. The PM also requests a meeting for discussing the current situation in Gabon. Thanks!

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-11-23: Please see comments above on reporting on the status of PPG utilization.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-11-23: Please see comments above on project maps and coordinates.

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**

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**