



Empowering Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to manage biodiversity data and information as a strategy to conserve their territories, safeguard traditional knowledge, and promote integrated biodiversity management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11269

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Empowering Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to manage biodiversity data and information as a strategy to conserve their territories, safeguard traditional knowledge, and promote integrated biodiversity management

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/21/2024

Review completed by PM

12/23/2024

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/26/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/20/2024

Yes.

8/27/2024

No, there isn't sufficient description of the climate change mitigation or adaptation benefits to justify the "significant objective" classification.

Agency Response

10/24/2024

The selection of Rio Markers has been appropriately adjusted in the CEO Endorsement (Table General Project Information) to reflect the focus of the project on biodiversity.

2. Project Summary.

- a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/21/2024

Yes.

8/27/2024

No, please revise the summary to be much more focused on the elements above. There is information discussed there that isn't discussed in the body of the project, which shouldn't be the case.

Agency Response

10/21/2024

The Summary has been replaced by a more concise text and encompassing all the project information.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2024

Yes.

11/21/2024

No.

c. The gender comments were not adequately addressed. The gender action plan prepared is very general. The GAP should be linked to the project document's components and outputs (as per our earlier comment). The GAP should be revised accordingly. The comment "please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project" was not reflected in the revised document as well.

d. On the description overview table, comments were not addressed: Still, the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.99%, for a co-financing of \$72,530,420 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,626,521 instead of \$2,167,445 (which is 2.98%). 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. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

8/27/2024

No.

a. Yes.

b. Yes, please note that we welcome provisions for the continued definition of project activities and locations through consultative processes. We note that the GEF policies themselves leave open significant room for changes as long as the project maintains the focus on the objective, and we hope all partners in the project can provide for this.

c. No, a. In Appendix 5, there is a section 5a: Gender Action Plan. This section is a narrative of what the project intends to do to advance gender equality and women's empowerment in the project. Please request the Agency to prepare a gender action plan (standard format is a table), with specific activities linked to the project components, outputs and activities, and the budget allocation for those.

b. Please ensure that all KM products and activities capture good practices and lessons learned from the perspectives of indigenous women communities and that during project implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

d. Yes.

e. Yes

Agency Response

12/20/2024

c. The GAP has been adjusted to the requested format with explicit links to the Project's Components and Outputs. The revised GAP has been included in the Roadmap ? Attached Documents section of the Portal.

d. The PMC counterpart as co-finance has been ensured through the pledge of the International Institute of Education (IEB), the proposed Executing Agency. The amount of co-finance committed by IEB is USD \$4,060,365 what in relation to the total co-finance amount of USD \$74,697,865.00 represents 5.44%, thus above the 5% of the GEF PMC commitment. Please refer to the Co-finance template included in the Roadmap ? Attached Documents section of the Portal, the edited information in the CEO Endorsement and related table at the GEF Portal.

10/21/2024

A revised GAP, within the Appendices document, includes the requested table. The requested table is also submitted separately.

4. Project Outline

A. Project 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 project design?
- b) Have 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 project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/25/2024

Yes.

8/27/2024

No.

- a. It would be good to outline the current situation for SiBBr and some of the key systems and institutions that make up the basis of this project. In particular, explaining a bit the consultative

processes that have been undertaken to design them. These programs, databases, etc. are mentioned without being explained and, importantly, with adequate assurances of consultation/safeguards. In addition, the choice of terms for Indigenous Peoples and traditional communities can be explained in this section and then used consistently in line with national circumstances.

b. Yes.

Agency Response

10/21/2024

In the CEO Endorsement, paragraphs from 16 to 20 have been edited to provide more detail on the consultative aspects of SiBBR for this Project; paragraphs 17 and 18 were rewritten, informing the ongoing processes on the debates related to traditional knowledge databases /databanks in Brazil. The SiBBR platform, due to its features, will contribute to addressing the project key issues related to consultation and registration of IPs and LCs TK, including the provenance of traditional knowledge. Paragraphs 19 and 20 highlight the articulations and partnerships carried out between the institutions responsible for the main systems that should have data and information interoperable with SiBBR - SISGEN and the Traditional Territories Platform.

Also, it has been included in the CEO Endorsement a figure from the Appendix Document (Supplementary Attachment 6), which illustrated the proposed flow of the traditional knowledge information.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

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

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project 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? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/25/2024

Yes.

8/27/2024

No.

a and b. Yes.

c.

Creating an expectation that all TK/genetic resources are registered - Is it possible that with greater efforts to register data that it will create the expectation that everything is registered? The result could be that if something is not there then the community will lack legal recourse to challenge the use of their data. With a more incomplete database (the current situation), there seems to be an understanding that much is missing; however, with a more complete database, the understanding could become that if something isn't registered then it doesn't count. If this is a possibility, how will the project work to prevent this result?

Knowledge management - The lessons learned and models for approaches will be incredibly valuable. It is worth recognizing that the education process potentially required for communities to create consultation processes and rules around data sharing are very significant in and of themselves. Therefore, developing and documenting these approaches is highly valuable. It is important to ensure that there are sufficient resources to support this documentation and synthesis across multiple approaches (e.g. comparing and contrasting the different paths and identifying what might make one better than another for a specific circumstances).

Species assessments - Please note that, unfortunately, with deforestation and fragmentation occurring around many TIs, the status of species may have changed despite the community's practices not changing and remaining sustainable. However, larger patterns of the landscape could place that species at risk. It will be important for species that are of cultural or other importance that the context

is taken into account so that communities can make management decisions from an informed perspective.

Delegation of authority - Noting that being informed is a key part of FPIC and that this may be harder to achieve in this context than some others, it may be worth considering whether communities would want to ask a smaller group to consider these issues that can spend the time necessary to be truly informed and then take decisions. (No response needed for this comment)

d-k. Yes.

l. Yes, this project is innovative in focusing on ABS from a holistic perspective.

Agency Response

10/21/2024

i) In paragraph 39, a more detailed explanation was added, highlighting that there is not an official database in Brazil on TK associated to genetic resources (there are some local initiatives at Universities that have sought to systematize this knowledge based on CARE principles, such as Useflora - <https://useflora.ufsc.br/>). What we have are several scattered publications, which are often not located and, therefore, cannot be used as a reference for queries on the use of a given species. Currently, no database is being used, for example, to reference information from SISGEN, which is a self-declared platform for researchers (bioprospecting or industry) who use biodiversity. In any case, one of the objectives of the training provided for in the project is to inform communities about the potential and limitations of a database, among which it is worth highlighting that feeding should be an ongoing activity with an effect in the medium and long term, but which becomes increasingly efficient in the long term.

ii) Through the two working groups planned in the project, which will also include representatives from IPs and LCs, we will co-design (i.e., participatory) knowledge management approaches and methodologies, including monitoring knowledge co-production processes, and all steps for the development of tools will be documented (This explanation has been included in paragraph 61).

iii) Paragraph 63 states that species assessments will be carried out taking environmental changes into account, using the SiBBR Spatial Portal, where it is possible, for example, to assess the degree of deforestation or isolation of a given territory. There is also information available on the websites of national organizations, as well as information already produced by Life Plans and Environmental and Territorial Management Plans (refer to explanation on PGTAs on paragraph 10 of the CEO Endorsement). In this sense, the assessment of the landscape will be taken into consideration and discussed with the communities so that they can make management decisions from an informed perspective.

iv) N/A

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes. We welcome the cooperation with other projects managed by IEB to work efficiently and effectively, such as the GBFF project, noting in particular that transportation maybe expensive and time consuming and to respect the time of the Indigenous communities. Therefore, we hope that these projects can work well together.

Agency ResponseN/A

5.3 Core indicators

- a) 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)?**
- b) Are the project'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?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/25/2024

Yes. Thank you for the edits. Please note that we acknowledge that some Indigenous communities may have concern about the term OECM and would like not to be counted there. These can be included under 4.1 if necessary even if they are considered a type of protected area by some. The primary objective of the indicators is to a good job of counting the hectares where the project is having an impact.

8/27/2024

No.

- a. Please provide a justification for the large change in hectares. Could the OECM indicator (4.5) be used?

At the first PIR, please include updated figures for hectares noting that territories remain to be selected.

b. Yes, we would like to encourage the use of biocultural indicators as part of this project. These can help measure wellbeing in ways that matter to the communities participating.

Agency Response

10/21/2024

The GEF Core Indicators spreadsheet has been edited to include, as suggested, the indicator 4.5 representing the territories (i.e., OECMs) in the Amazon and the Cerrado Biomes where the interventions will take place (i.e., at the community level). An addition to paragraph 90 (page 48) explains this inclusion in more detail. The Core Indicators template is submitted in a separate file.

5.4 Risks

- 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, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency ResponseN/A

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/23/2024

Yes.

12/16/2024

Please upload the revised letter.

11/25/2024

No, please correct the financing letter from MMA.

8/27/2024

No. a. The Public Investment of USD 2 million from MCTI appears to be in-kind (Recurrent Expenditures). Please review and edit the classification accordingly. If these funds are indeed Public Investment, the category should be changed from Recurrent Expenditures to Investment Mobilized.

b. The cofinancing letter lists all financial instruments, which seems to be a template error. Please confirm the correct financial instruments for the USD 31.25 million in public investment and USD 187,500 in in-kind contributions, and make the necessary correction.

c. The USD 1.6 million in-kind contribution from CNPq is recorded in the GEF portal as Public Investment (Investment Mobilized). Please address this inconsistency.

Agency Response

12/17/2024

Please find revised co-finance letter from the Ministry of Environment (MMA) uploaded at the GEF Portal.

10/21/2024

The information in the co-financing table in Annex A has been properly edited. The co-financing template has been uploaded as a separate file.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/25/2024

Yes.

8/27/2024

No, please include the logframe with indicators in the template and the ProDoc.

a. Please include CI with the project components.

b. Please include some indicators that indicate the quality of the products produced/activities undertaken. Right now, most of the indicators are number of plans or number of people or similar that don't actually get at whether something was done well and/or actually achieved the goal.

c. Yes.

d. Yes.

Agency Response

10/21/2024

a) Additional information has been included in paragraph 90 (on page 49) with an explanation of the edition of the GEF Core Indicators. The GEF Core Indicators template is submitted as a separate file.

b) The Results Framework Template, *submitted as a separate file), have been edited to include qualitative indicators for the Project Outcomes, with attention to include biocultural and qualitative indicators.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/27/2024

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/17/25

Yes.

12/23/2024

No. Please address the following -

a. the GEF budget table displayed in the Annex G: Budget table in the CEO Endorsement Portal view (which is the document that is circulated and web posted) is getting cut and missing the columns "Total" and "Responsible Entity". Please request the agency to upload the appropriate budget table in this section and to engage with ITS ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org if necessary.

b. For consistency throughout the document, please request the agency to include IEB as the Responsible Entity for the "Other Operating Costs" budget lines.

c. We will review the budget table per the resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

11/25/2024

No. Please address the following.

1. On the budget:

Please request the agency to remove the file related to co-financing in the Annex G: Budget table. Please only include the GEF Budget Table. Additionally, the GEF budget table attached to the Annex G: Budget table in the CEO Endorsement Portal view (which is the document that is circulated and web posted), was not updated, and continue to have all previous comments pending to be addressed. Please upload the appropriate budget table in this section. We take note of the agency's comments in the review sheet and reviewed the budget table submitted as separate files, named "GEF_Project_Budget_Template-GEFSEC Review Adjustments" in the Documents tab of the GEF Portal. "IPLC Organization" and "RNP" are listed as Responsible Entities in the budget table, but these entities are not listed in the Project Information section of

the GEF Portal. Please request the agency to amend the budget table or to include these entities in the respective sections of the GEF Portal, including Project Information and Institutional Arrangement.

We will review the final budget table per the resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

8/27/2024

No.

a. The M&E cost is high, representing 7.6% of the total GEF Financing: GEF guidelines recommends the average cost of 3% for projects whose budget is between USD 5 to USD 10 million. Please ask the Agency to revise. ab. The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.99%, for a co-financing of \$72,530,420 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,626,521 instead of \$2,167,445 (which is 2.98%). 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. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

a. Please request the agency to remove the file related to co-financing in the Annex G: Budget table. It is not readable in the PDF file (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted).

b. ?IT equipment?, ?IT and communication equipment? must be charged to PMC, not to project components.

c. There seems to be a duplication of items in the budget table in the categories of ?Goods? and ?Contractual Services ? Company?. Please request the agency to amend.

d. A ?Project Manager? and a ?Project Assistant? are being charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

e. ?Office supplies? must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to

PMC.

f. Unspecified 'Miscellaneous' item (US\$ 10,152.78) is not an eligible category ? please ask the Agency to remove this category or provide details.

Agency Response

01/13/2025

a. The budget template has been saved as Portrait format to properly fit within the GEF Portal page boundaries.

b. The responsibility of budget lines regarding 'other operating costs' have been assigned to IEB, the Executing Agency.

12/20/2024

? The co-finance template has been removed from the Annex G Section.

? In the GEF Budget Template, as the IP and LCs organizations and RNP will be partners of the project, but the resources will be managed by IEB ? the proposed Executing Agency, their indication as Responsible Entity has been replaced by IEB. Nevertheless, the description of their role in the project governance was already described in paragraph 81, now highlighted for easier reference.

The updated GEF Budget template has been uploaded to the Annex G Section

10/21/2024

a) The budget templates have been revised to ensure that the M&E costs are within the 3% limit. The budget templates are submitted as separate files.

b) the line for IT equipment has been eliminated and the resources embedded within the respective sub-grants.

c) the duplication has been detected and eliminated.

d) all positions to be hired by the project have been revised with more adequate titles provided, so that it is clear the managerial positions; all TORs have been revised and are included in the Annex 5c of the Appendices document and submitted as a separate file.

e) office supplies have been included in the costs of the activities.

f) the line for miscellaneous has been eliminated.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/17/2025

Yes, thank you for the changes.

1/10/2025

No, please address the remaining issues with the budget. Our Portal IT team is available to help with issues.

12/17/2024

Not at this time. Please make the revisions requested above.

12/16/2024

Sending back for the co-financing letter.

11/25/2024

A few small issues remain.

8/27/2024

Not at this time. Overall the project is strong, but needs some revisions.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		