



Resilience Enhancement through Adaptation in the Pacific (REAP)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11702

Countries

Regional (Fiji, Micronesia, Nauru)

Project Name

Resilience Enhancement through Adaptation in the Pacific (REAP)

Agencies

ADB

Date received by PM

9/18/2024

Review completed by PM

10/27/2024

Program Manager

Tshewang Dorji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

10/29/2024, GEFSEC

Addressed. Thanks

Update, 10/29/2024:

Child Micronesia GEFID 11704:

The executing agency listed in the PFD has different acronym than the one displayed in the child project information. Please ensure consistency between the PFD and its child project entries

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/26/24, GEFSEC:

Please review the financial information with possible additional regional set-aside resources for coordination support, as appropriate

Also, the Taxonomy needs to include more adaptation-relevant keywords, e.g. (as relevant): coastal protection, climate-resilient infrastructure; nature-based solutions; flood; drought; climate-resilient tourism; etc

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

Regional set aside has been included.

Taxonomy has been adjusted, although not all keywords requested were available as options.

29 Oct

Addressed

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

a) Yes

b) Yes

a) Please adjust the summary text to reflect what the program seek to achieve, how the child projects will support climate change adaptation in each country, and how the regional element will be woven across the program. Also, clarify main climate hazard(s) and its consequences on the livelihood, and the sectors that the program is intending to enhance resilience.

b) Thanks for the information that this phase will cover three of the 14 PSIDS. Kindly provide clarity on the sector coverage for respective countries with a brief explanation of its contribution to transformative or innovative climate adaptation action, if any.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

a) done

b) some references on transformation included in narrative

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

10/29/2024, GEFSEC

Addressed. Thanks

Update, 10/29/2024:

M&E costs are around 4.6% which is above the average 3% for projects from USD 5 to USD 10 million. Please request the Agency to revise.

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d & e) Yes and GEF contribution to PMC is 4%.

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

a) The program objective seems abstract. This could be attributed due to lack of clarity on what are the main climate change problem that program is intending to address in the specific location in three countries.

b). As mention above, it remains unclear on how the activities and output can contribute to the outcome and program objective, in light of lack of clarity on the climate rationale of the program. Please build the program to address the climate problem that countries/region is facing

c) Please strengthen gender-related elements across the components (refer to specific comments are under 5.g) and include discussion in the PFD on how vulnerability of women will be reduced, as well as how civil society will be engaged in project implementation. Also, it was observed that M&E costs are around 3.9% which is above the average 3% for projects from USD 5 to USD 10 million. Please revise.

d) No. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$31,200,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,557,192 instead of \$1,200,000 (which is 3.8%). As the costs associated with the project management must 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.

e) Yes, it is below 5%.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

a) Revised

b) Revised

c) Revised with gender references. On M&E there was a misunderstanding This amount includes both the progress monitoring as well as the compulsory MTR/TE. We have split this into two outputs for clarity and added notation that MTR and TER costs will be roughly \$ 225 total.

d) Adjusted.

29 Oct

M&E Adjusted

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGL, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

- a) Yes
- b) Yes
- c) Yes
- d) Yes
- e) n/a

Update 10/3/24, GEFSEC:

- a) Please highlight what are the main climate hazards that target countries are exposed to? What will be the projected impacts or scenarios for the region into the mid century? How is the hazard likely to have negative consequences on different sector that program intends to address it? What are the underlying socio economic and other conditions that could help with setting context of the climate vulnerabilities?
- b). Thanks for outlining the role of community and private sector in the program. However, please provide further elaboration on the plans for additional consultations and efforts to develop stakeholder engagement plan, including how the local community will be engaged.
- c). Please describe how the project will build upon the baseline projects, and how it is going to contribute to other initiatives such RPACA.
- d). Please indicate how the lesson from the ongoing regional program and projects will inform the design of this program?
- e). n/a

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

a) Done

b) Done

c) Done. RPACA is still in early stages.

d) Done

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Update 10/3/24, GEFSEC:

a). Given the lack of clarity on the climate rationale of the program, the suggested ToC needs to be revised. The revision need to take into account clear pathways between program objective and components. At its current state, the ToC doesn't adequately establishes the logic and pathways. Just as an example, the proposed outcome 1 and output 1.1 are disjointed. Similarly, the reference to the project in India isn't articulated fir its relevance. Therefore, kindly revise the ToC with clear program objective that has strong climate risk basis/justification for the proposed components. A clear pathways connecting activities, outputs, outcomes and objectives will be crucial to help with review of the program.

For Output 1.1: Please provide more detail in the discussion on data, information and platforms, as it not clear. Which types of data and platforms are being referred to? Will the project support training of country technical personnel on the use and management of the data and platforms? If so, please include this aspect in the PFD.

Output 3.2: It is important for a regional program of this nature to make a proactive effort to coordinate or synergize with support being provided by other sources of finance including climate funds such as the GCF, AF, or CIFs. Please change the value of the relevant meta-indicators (re coordination with other funds) to "true". Please include a brief discussion of relevant initiatives being supported by some of these sources of finance in the PFD. Please make an effort for the program to link up with regional platforms and/or opportunities for regional learning that are being established by other sources that are expected to have widespread utility and usage

b). Fiji: Please ensure that the Program will help the country to take into consideration exposure of WWTP to the coastal flooding, as a means of resilience building.

FSM: It seems that ongoing ADB PRF has a wide coverage on the study component in Kosrea. It may be best for SCCF resources to assist with climate proofing water infrastructure and setting up Early Warning system. Also, please check if FSM is envisioning support under the SOFF for the EWS with the view to build synergies.

Nauru: Similar to FSM, the this program has an opportunity to avoid duplication with ADB project and focus on building resilience in the housing sector and integrated EWS. Alternatively, as a humble suggestion, the SCCF support could be used to conduct all the assessment as planned to pave the way for ADB and other investors.

Overall, please harmonize the presentation of information on the ongoing or past project under a single section of easy reference, and then articulate value addition of this program.

- c). The current description of program component isn't clear enough to justify the component selection and its approaches, including articulation of the climate hazards and its associated problem that program is intending to address it.
- d) Please elaborate clearly the value-add of regional program rather than as standalone national projects
- e).Please describe relevant levers of transformation
- f). Please clarify how relevant stakeholder will contribute to design and implementation of the program.
- g) Please strengthen gender-related elements across the components and include discussion in the PFD on how vulnerability of women will be reduced, as well as how civil society will be engaged in project implementation. Examples of entry points for strengthening gender perspectives includes: Output 1.1. - We suggest to create a forum to discuss plans, strategies and policy include gender experts and women's voices/representatives from the communities; Output 2.1 - please reflect how women's perspectives will be taken into account, and demonstrate that they will be among the beneficiaries of capacity-building and training on NBS. Please ensure that Performance Monitoring, MTR and TE also report on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the project Gender Action Plan

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

- a) Revised. ToC has been aligned with the revised program objective, components, outcomes and outputs.

A new Output (1.1) has been added Outcome 1 in response to the above comments on Outcome 1 and Output 1.1. Previous Output 1.1 is now Output 1.2

Output 1.2 refers to web-based platforms on climate data. The program will organize 4 webinars for technical personnel from participating countries.

Output 3.2 expanded

- b) Fiji: A study on climate-proofing the WWTP is ongoing through separate ADB financing and will guide and inform the project going forward.

FSM: The ADB PRF in FSM is in initial pre-concept stage. The application will be going to ADB 14 window and not confirmed until 2025. FSM SCCF project interventions primarily centre

around climate proofing of water infrastructure and EWS. So this will be considered in the framing of the PRF to avoid duplication and rather consider complementarity. These matters will be sorted during PPG.

Nauru: A similar situation. The coastal protection project is still in pre-concept and planning for financing through the ADF 14 window. (in future) Nauru would still like to retain the child project concept in current form. However we have included a newly approved reference project which aims to provide sustainable, inclusive and resilient urban services including reticulated water supply system. During PPG this project may also be included as a baseline (and co-financing) for the child project

- a) c) Some modifications included
- d) d) Comments on value add have been included
- e) References included
- f) Some narrative included
- g) Component level adjustments have been made

RE: Output 1.1 Addressed through revised outcomes & outputs

RE: Output 2.1 revised with commensurate revisions to the performance monitoring section.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

- a) Please provide how to ensure resilience to the anticipated future change in climate impacts
- b) Please elaborate its potential for transformational adaptation, innovation and scaling up, as relevant
- c) Yes
- d) Please articulate on how the child projects are reflective of program objective.
- e) Yes

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

- a) Done
- b) References included in narrative. Includes focus on NbS
- d) Addressed.

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

- a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**
- b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

Secretariat's Comments

10/29/2024, GEFSEC

Addressed. Thanks

Update 10/29/24, GEFSEC:

- a). The GEF policies, further explained in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, require that the separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions performed by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF Partnership and an important aspect of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards. See https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf. (pages 44-45)

At this stage, Agency (?dual?) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution, the Agency would submit full information and justification for a request for policy exception.

Therefore, Please amend and remove ?Yes? in response to the question ?Is the GEF Agency being asked to play an execution role on this program??

b). Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

a). There is a conflicting information on the executing role of the agency. While there might be challenges in finding appropriate regional organization for execution, it is suggested that carryout further consultation and determine during the PPG phase.

b). It will useful to gain insights into the mechanism to be put in place for better coordination and cooperation with other projects in the region/country. Please provide.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

a) Noted and addressed. Again, given the small amount of funds at program level, it is unlikely that this will be executed by an external party, especially as some in the Pacific want to charge overheads.

b) ADB approach would be to ensure that the SCCF initiatives are tightly aligned with the national baseline projects in order to ensure coordination during implementation and also achieve economy of scale

29 Oct

YES is removed and will be reviewed during PPG

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF

Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

a) Yes

b) Please consider reviewing the result figure with the view to enhance it. Also, on the core indicator 2, please clarify if it is 2 (a), 2 (b) or both. Also, please "true" for the SCCF-B utilization, if regional resources will be used for the coordination activities.

c) Yes, but refer to b above

d). Please describe additional socio-economic benefit of the program.

e) Ye.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

b) noted and addressed

d) Narrative included

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Update 10/3/24, GEFSEC:

Please provide explanation of risk and mitigation measures for the overall risk

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

Done.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

a). Yes

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Please describe how the program aligns with country priorities, including MEA

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

Added (the country child projects are aligned with the country NAP/NDC and reflected in the child project concept)

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

GEFSEC, 9/26/2022:

Please discuss the programmatic elements of the regional knowledge and learning exchange more thoroughly in the PFD. This should not focus on communications of the Agency with the project counterparts or engagement of professionals; rather, it should focus on enhancing learning on climate change adaptation within and also across the participating countries, whether at the level of adaptation professionals, data experts, infrastructure professionals/engineers, NbS experts etc.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

Knowledge management actions have been expanded.

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

10/3/24, GEFSEC:

On Financing Table:

Child Micronesia GEFID 11704: LoE is missing the Focal Area Source. Please obtain a revised LOE or an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing with the Focal Area Source

Child Fiji GEFID11703: LoE is missing the Focal Area Source. Please obtain a revised LOE or an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing with the Focal Area Source

Child Nauru GEFID 11705: LoE is missing the Focal Area Source. Please obtain a revised LOE or an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing with the Focal Area Source

On Project Information

1. Child Micronesia GEFID 11704: Title of child project differs between LoE and Portal's child project entry, please either obtain revised LoE or correct child project's title to match with LoE. Also, the executing agency listed in the PFD has different acronym than the one displayed in the child project information. Please ensure consistency between the PFD and its child project entries
2. Child Fiji GEFID 11703: The executing agency listed in the PFD is different than the one displayed in the child project information. Please ensure consistency between the PFD and its child project entries.

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

LOEs ? emails received from 3 OFP offices and annexed to original LOEs and re-uploaded with revised date.

GEF ID 11704: Title synchronized

GEF ID 11703: Adjusted

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Please reflect as both SCCF-A and SCCF - B

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

Done

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes, but please fold it under 2.1 in a single row

Agency's Comments

18 Oct 2024

This table is auto-generated and cannot be "folded". It automatically disaggregates all the child projects.

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Compilation of Letters of Endorsement Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

10/29/2024, GEFSEC

Addressed, and therefore, recommended for clearance

Update 10/29/2024:

Please address the comments on consistency of acronym for executing agency listed in the PFD and is Child Project, share of M&E cost and agency executing role.

10/27/24, GEFSEC:

Comments are adequately addressed. Therefore, recommended for clearance.

9/20/24, GEFSEC:

Not yet.

10/21/24: GEFSEC.

Not yet

Agency's Comments

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		