



Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11148

Countries

Global (Colombia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand, Uganda, Zambia)

Project Name

Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program

Agencies

World Bank, UNDP, ADB, WWF-US, CI, IUCN, UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/17/2023

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

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

4.19.23: Yes, cleared.

11.2.23: Please, note the possibility of adjusting the deadline for submission of child projects for CEO Endorsement / CEO Approval for 18 months after Council approval of the PFD. The Program Commitment Deadline after Council approval in Feb 2024 will be 9 August 2025.

GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	12/30/2024
---------------------	------------------	------------------------------	------------

Agency's Comments

11.7.23: The Program Commitment Deadline has been adjusted to 9 August 2025.

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

Secretariat's Comments 4.19.23: Yes, cleared.

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

4.19.23: The summary describes well the problem to be addressed and the program objectives, but misses to highlight the key outcomes and the transformative and innovative nature of proposed activities. Please, include these aspects for a complete summary.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments The brief program summary has been revised to highlight the program components and four long-term outcomes as well as the GEBs/socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by WCD IP and its transformative and innovative nature.

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

4.20.21: The Program objective makes reference to "transforming the drivers of species loss". Since the Program will be assessed against its objective at completion, kindly ensure that outcome indicators are available to measure the "transformation of the drivers of species loss" to indicate attributable progress by program completion. It would be useful to confirm adequate indicators are available to measure this element of the objective. Alternatively, it could be consider toning down this aspect of the objective in a way that is more similar to the project objective used in earlier phases of the program.

The GEF Program financing and co-financing parts to the PMC are not proportional. The GEF funded PMC in below 5%. Please explain the difference in PMC allocations.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments

Program objective: Thank you for this comment and suggested options to resolve. After consideration of the options, we have decided to revise the program objective to enable clearer measurement. The updated program objective is: To conserve wildlife and landscapes to maximize global environmental benefits and ensure that countries and communities are benefiting from these natural assets. The revision better reflects the multiple GEBs expected of IPs. It does not change the scope or ambition of the IP and presents a more positive formulation of expected impact. This has been updated in the indicative program overview and other parts of the submission as required. No changes to

the program outcomes or proposed indicators are required as they already line up to the revised objective and will enable measurement of progress towards its achievement.

PMC Financing: The program estimates for PMC and PMC co-financing were aggregated based on initial estimates provided by GEF Agencies for country projects and the global coordination project (additional information requested by WCD IP in concept notes). This confirms the GEF contribution towards PMC at less than 5% of program financing, in accordance with GEF policies. The aggregated co-financing contribution to PMC at concept note stage was estimated at a slightly higher percentage of program financing, in large part due to the significant existing investment that projects will build off in many countries through aligned donor-funded projects and in a few instances, MDB loans. To make the co-financing contribution to PMC more conservative at concept note stage, the estimated co-financing contribution has been revised down for some projects, resulting in a more balanced 5% of estimated co-financing contribution against PMC. All co-financing contributions for child projects will be confirmed and updated during PPG phase.

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 NGI, 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

4.21.23: The program design adequately describes the problem, drivers and incorporates lessons learned from the previous programs. The baseline is adequately framed and described justifying GEF investments to conserve wildlife and landscapes that will generate global environmental. For CEO endorsement, it will important that each child project expand the baseline and incremental reasoning with more detailed information on the national context and articulate the links to this global vision.

Under "threat #5" we recommend rewording the phrase: "Disease caught from contact by wildlife with humans and their domestic animals or livestock threatens the health and well-being of wildlife, humans and livestock." This sentence currently ends with "is a small but growing direct threat" which is a bit confusing given the extent and thought-to-be under counted/undetected level of level of spillover events.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments

Alignment of projects to program: During PPG phase, country projects will complement the program-wide baseline and incremental reasoning with their own national contexts. We agree that it is important that this clearly links to the global vision. The World Bank as lead agency will offer support during PPG phase to help strengthen alignment to the program framework and identify opportunities for project-project collaboration and learning across the program.

Threat #5: The description of this threat has been revised to better clarify that this is an important and increasingly-recognized threat with potential impacts on conservation of wildlife and on human health and economies.

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

4.22.23: Excellent TOC, explanation and graphic. Please ensure that TOC graphic is within the boundaries of the Portal. Currently it overflows and will not be able to be furnished to STAP and Council with the sides cut off.

The IF Then Because statement is strong. Please revise/clarify IF statement to align more closely with both the goal of the IP and the Because statement. Currently the focus of the ?Then? statement is focused on the extent to which the investment will ?make a significant contribution to? rather than the intended result of the WCD IP.

TOC and description currently has a heavy emphasis on investment in wildlife-based economies and wildlife conservation-linked livelihoods as a pathway to increasing community buy-in and support for wildlife conservation. While this is a critical element we suggest also including/addressing the need for sustainable sources of livelihood that actively and directly reduce threats/pressures on wildlife through substitution. An essential factor to make this assumption work (e.g. substitution) is to have a strong accompanying enabling governance/management regime to ensure compliance/enforcement and resulting benefit for wildlife and people.

Regarding the components and outcomes:

- ? Component 1: Please revise component language to read ?Coexistence of people and wildlife in **landscapes**? (versus ?connected habitats?). Reasoning: The GEF-8 Strategy contains specific language for component one focused on wildlife landscapes which is an intentionally inclusive and integrated approach to area-based conservation well aligned with the ambition of GEF-8 integrated programs and the GEF-8 BD focal area landscape focus. This was a point of feedback and deep consideration during the reviews of the GEF-8 strategy during the replenishment.
- ? Outcome 1.5: ?Interfaces? in this outcome refers to geographic interfaces (e.g. forest buffers or fragments etc), correct? This is as opposed to interfaces in markets in cities, or interfaces in airport customs offices or interfaces in pet stores or peoples? homes? If this

is accurate it is worth noting in the outcome language somehow-because this will also differentiate from Component 2 in terms of trade.

- ? Component 2: In description of this component, please note in the description the importance of wild meat to local food security and the need for effective and culturally appropriate approach to education and behavior change and provision of options to address protein and food security elements of consumption. Or some such acknowledgement of those dimensions.
- ? Component 3: Suggest directly referencing support for the diversification of livelihoods for resilience and livelihoods developed to take pressure off wildlife resources, both of which are above and beyond current framing of livelihoods derived directly from wildlife conservation for increased incentive/buy-in. see subsequent comment on this in regards to the TOC.

Please double check the excellent footnotes in the **Program description section** of the PFD as they currently link to the footnotes in the previous section (e.g. the statement and the citation or note in the Program description aren't linked to each other-they both link back to the previous section's footnote or text). Please remedy.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments

Theory of change: The IF/THEN/BECAUSE statement has been revised to align to the new program objective. The THEN statement now more clearly reflects the program impact in terms of integrated GEBs and socioeconomic contributions to development.

The TOC diagram (Figure 4) and related narrative in the submission has been updated to show the investment under Component 3 in both wildlife-conservation linked livelihoods and in diversified, sustainable livelihoods that reduce unsustainable pressures on natural resources driven by rural poverty and lack of viable livelihoods. Minor revision to Component 3 outcomes has been made to reflect this, and a new assumption added to the TOC that viable livelihood options aligned to community preferences can be provided in order to achieve the reduced pressure on wildlife and habitats. Figure 4 has also been updated to reflect other associated edits to the wording of the program objective, outcomes, components, etc.

The alignment of the TOC diagram in Figure 4 has been checked with GEF IT who confirm that it is showing within the boundaries of the portal.

Components and outcomes:

•**Component 1:** wording has been updated as requested, with a minor grammatical revision to 'coexistence of people and wildlife across connected landscapes' to ensure the connectivity aspects of the program are retained alongside the emphasis on landscape-level action.

•**Outcome 1.5:** The interpretation is correct that Outcome 1.5 will cover geographic or ecosystem-based interfaces that bring the movement of people, their livestock and wildlife into contact with high-risk of zoonotic spillover. In parallel, Component 2 (multiple outcomes, including 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5) will cover supply chain aspects and risks related to wildlife trade and consumption (whether legal or illegal). In practice the two will often be closely linked in projects, but this formulation allows for WCD IP to recognize the need for actions at both landscape and supply chain level, depending on the specific risks and national/local contexts. This has been more clearly clarified in the wording of Outcome 1.5 which now refers to 'ecosystem-based' interfaces for zoonotic spillover, and in updated descriptions for interventions to address zoonotic spillover risk under both Components. New wording for Outcome 1.5 has been reflected across the submission.

•**Component 2:** The narrative for Component 2 has been revised to better capture the importance of wild meat consumption to local food security and IPLC cultural identity in many WCD IP participating countries. The need for culturally-appropriate education, awareness and behavior change as well as consideration of alternative protein sources to replace wild meat is captured in program interventions.

•**Component 3:** The description of Component 3 has been revised to reflect the diversification of livelihoods to take pressure off livelihoods resources, recognize the role of rural poverty in driving threats as shown in Figure 3, as well as direct wildlife-based livelihoods. Minor revisions have been made to the narrative, outcomes and TOC assumptions to ensure both aspects are reflected. Both avenues of livelihoods diversification will be pursued by WCD IP projects.

Linking of footnotes: This has been checked with GEF IT who confirm that footnotes in the portal PFD entry are linking to the correct sections of text.

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

4.22.23: This WCD IP is innovative in its expanding investments in on global wildlife conservation efforts. Program interventions should not simply focus on specific sites but rather on mechanisms and enabling conditions, to be enhanced by collaboration of the countries to improve the policy, regulatory and legal frameworks. Please, indicate the elements of the project design that will ensure resilience and allow for adaptive management in face of changes in the national, regional and global contexts.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments Additional description has been added to the Program Description to show how the program design will facilitate resilience and allow for adaptive management in line with shifting changes in national, regional and global contexts. For example, landscape-focussed rather than site-based efforts will build resilience of ecosystems, while improved governance, benefit-sharing and capacity of local institutions will support community resilience, with landscape planning, governance and human-wildlife coexistence building resilience to further pressures on land use rise that may arise including through shifting national policy contexts. Strengthened law enforcement, cohesive policies and regulations, and anti-poaching efforts ? across multiple countries ? will build resilience against geographic shifts in trafficking to exploit weaker enforcement, and better preparedness to address emerging crime trends. Efforts to understand zoonotic spillover risk builds resilience and preparedness for future emerging infectious diseases. The design of Component 3 supports the resilience of program interventions under Component 1 and 2 by putting in place improved financing and livelihoods to reduce pressures on natural resources and ensure communities benefit from healthy wildlife populations, with diversification of livelihoods building resilience against potential future downturn in tourism trends cutting tourism-reliant income. The knowledge and coordination platform under Component 4 will enable transformative change and innovation through a range of mechanisms for countries to share, co-design, and learn from each other?s approaches, successes and failures, promoting adaptive management and giving countries opportunities to share their adaptive management experiences with each other. Text has been added under each of the four Program Components to describe these.

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 4.22.23: The GWP Program has established a strong governance model for collaboration and capacity building that reflected and strengthened under the WCD IP.

Agency's Comments

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 adaptive management?

Secretariat's Comments

04.20.23: Core Indicators:

o Core Indicator 1.2 : Please consider listing the Name of the PAs, WDPA ID, IUCN Category of the PAs covered, as available.

o Core Indicator 3: Is it accurate that there are no expected restoration results? Currently the core indicator table is blank for CI 3 on restoration. Please revise or explain.

o Core Indicator 4.5: Please ensure the full extent of OECMs planned to be covered by the Program are listed. OECMs do not aggregate up to the main Core Indicator 4. This

means the same area listed under sub-indicator 4.1 can also be marked as an OECM under 4.5. In addition, please indicate any other information as available: Name, WDPA ID.

o Core Indicator 6: Total PFD CI6 estimate for the WCD IP is 141 Mil tCO₂e, this is about 3.3x greater than blind estimates at Replenishment Negotiations level for GEF-8. Two child-projects (Indonesia 98M tons and Uganda 26M tons) represent 81% of total volumes for CI6 at Program level (115M out of 141M): it is important that these two projects are checked, as might have been overestimated. Please, include the anticipated start year and duration of accounting. Kindly also clarify in the justification on targets what results are expected outside of the AFOLU sector.

o Core Indicator 11: Please consider revising the number of people directly benefiting from the program as it currently indicates only 2 direct beneficiaries.

5.15.23: In relation to CI 6, please include the anticipated start year of accounting.

11.2.23: Please consider ensuring that the sum of Core and Sub-Indicator values across child projects adds up to the value entered at PFD level.

Agency's Comments

•**Core Indicator 1.2:** The names of the PAs, WDPA ID, and the relevant IUCN Category for each PA covered have now been updated in the Portal for 13 countries for which the information is currently available. For Mexico, and the Philippines, the exact project sites have not been determined at the concept note phase and relevant details will be confirmed during PPG.

•**Core Indicator 3:** At concept note phase the IP contribution to Core Indicator 3 is 37,040 ha, with expected contributions from Colombia and Uganda. This has been checked with GEF IT who confirm that 37,040 ha has been entered correctly and is showing in the portal submission. The accompanying narrative explains the contributions. Further contributions from other national projects may be identified during PPG phase.

•**Core Indicator 4.5:** The total area under sub-indicator 4.5. has now been expanded to 882,862 hectares, including 100,000 hectares in Mexico (exact sites TBD), 6,000 hectares in the Philippines (exact sites TBD), and 776,862 hectares in Kenya (the total area of three community conservancies in key HWC hotspots, likely two in Laikipia County and one in Kajiado County, to be determined at PPG.). Further contributions

from other national projects may be identified during PPG phase and will be confirmed by individual projects at CEO Endorsement.

•**Core Indicator 6:** The revised total estimate for Core Indicator 6 is now approximately 61 million tCO₂-e, or 140% of the blind estimates provided at the GEF-8 Replenishment Negotiations. Indonesia has revised its estimate to 23.4 million (from 89 million) and Ethiopia to 12.3 million (from 26 million). The start year and duration of accounting have been provided for each relevant project in the Portal and in the accompanying concept notes wherever available. At PFD level, the Portal only has one field in which to input the start year. We have left this field blank as the start year will differ by each project and cannot be provided at Program level. The duration of accounting for all projects is expected to be 20 years but will be confirmed during PPG and documented in CEO Endorsement submissions. Only one country is expecting to contribute to GHG emissions avoided outside of AFOLU ? Guinea expects 5,000 tCO₂-e of GHG to be avoided due to use of improved cooking stoves in the households living in the Folonigb? reserve. In the first submission, another country, Uganda, was included under this sub-indicator. However, upon review, the expected ~3 million tCO₂-e of GHG avoided are more appropriately placed under sub-indicator 6.1 (carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of AFOLU) and this change has now been made. The text in the description section in the Portal has been updated accordingly.

Core Indicator 11: Unfortunately, this data was corrupted and lost in the initial portal submission. The correct beneficiary contributions of 1,068,009 have been re-entered into the portal. The accompanying narrative explains how the beneficiary estimates have been calculated at concept note stage.

WB 5/16/23:

The anticipated start year of accounting has been added to the Portal at PFD level, estimated at 2025. For specific details on individual projects, please see the respective concept notes in Annex H.

11.7.23: We reviewed Core and Sub-core indicators at the PFD level, checked figures across all child projects, and made the following corrections:

- ? **Core Indicator 1:** the text that was entered below the table at PFD level for sub-indicator 1.1 has been corrected. The new value is 206,300 hectares instead of the previous 205,300 hectares. Also, the extra figures that were present in brackets for Indonesia and Thailand have been removed from the Portal.
- ? **Core Indicator 3:** the text that was entered below the table at PFD level for Uganda has been corrected, and the new value is 26,740 hectares instead of the previous 27,740 hectares.

- ? **Core Indicator 6:** The new figure for metric tons of CO2-eq in the Core Indicator table is 61,689,190, which is slightly different from the previous figure of 61,686,307. As a result, the text below the table at PFD level has been adjusted accordingly. Additionally, the figure for Indonesia has been corrected to 23,402,883 in the text below the table, which was previously stated as 23,400,000.)
- ? **Core Indicator 11:** the updated figures in the Core Indicator table and the text below have been corrected to 1,068,489 people, 544,942 women (51%) and 523,547 men (49%) (previously was 1,068,009 people, 544,900 women (51%) and 523,109 men.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?
- 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 4.24.23: Risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures are adequately described.

Agency's Comments

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

4.19.23: The proposed Program is well aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives. as well as the Focal Area elements (BD, CC and LD), as described in the GEF 8 Programming Directions.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4.19.23: The child project selection criteria are well defined.

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

4.24.23: Please revise this section to include an increased focus/emphasis/discussion on the contributions of WCD-IP to the Kunming-Montreal GBF, particularly considering the level of detail regarding complementarity to other MEAs for which the GEF is not the financial mechanism. Please consider include a crosswalk of the contributions of the WCD-IP components/outcomes to various GBF targets (see as reference the CFB Indo Malaya IP that did this well in annex 2b of the PFD).

Please, include a sentence in there that clarifies that the GEF interventions are to generate global environmental benefits of direct relevance to the Conventions that the GEF serves, aligned with national priorities. Integration (and holistic policy frameworks, systemic approaches, etc?) can generate cross-cutting and multiple benefits that are aligned with goals of other BD-related conventions. Check wording tin GEF-8 strategy on this for further reference.

Please redact the following sentence as it pre-supposes outcomes of a future COP of a convention the GEF is not the financial mechanism for: *?The 14th CMS Conference of the Parties, taking place in October 2023, may adopt further Decisions with strong alignment to WCD outcomes and that will be supported by proposed project activities?* and *?Both CITES and CMS Secretariats are members of the WCD Program Steering Committee to help guide and realize these synergies in implementation,?* Given the wide array of participating stakeholders on the PSC.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments

Contributions to MEAs: The narrative on WCD IP contributions to conventions that the GEF finances has been strengthened and prioritized in the narrative, incorporating text that GEF financing under WCD IP will generate global environmental benefits of direct significance to relevant conventions that it provides the financial mechanism for. The text on contributions to the GBF has been elaborated and a cross-walk from WCD IP components/outcomes against GBF targets included as Table 2. This initial assessment

can be further refined as country projects develop their detailed interventions and WCD IP indicators are confirmed in PPG phase.

Redactions: Requested text has been redacted from the resubmission.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments 4.19.23: Policy requirements sections is completed.

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 4.19.23: Safeguard screening conducted indicates the overall risk rating at program level, considering the program objective, outcomes and likely interventions by country projects, as Substantial. Annex D has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

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

4.23.23: While an overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been described in the Program Description and some communications activities are mentioned here and there, there is no reference to an overall communications strategy/plan for the Program. Thus, the agency is requested to include a brief description of a coherent communications strategy/plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects. This should also be properly budgeted into the Program.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments A brief description of the program's approach for communications and outreach has been added to the narrative for Component 4. This will include the development of a program communications strategy during the PPG phase of the global coordination project, as well as a branding strategy for WCD IP that builds off GWP. These PPG activities have been captured in both the PFD and the concept note for the global coordination project. Budget will be set aside in the global coordination project for implementation of the program communications strategy. In addition, country projects will include budget for targeted communications and outreach efforts.

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

4.24.23: The the total budget (including agency fee) for the Coordination Child Project is US\$16,020,000. Please, adjust the financial tables accordingly.

5.15.23: Cleared

Agency's Comments The submission had used the financing figures communicated by GEF Secretariat to Agencies on platform budgets for IP coordination projects on 3 April. This has now been updated to reflect the amount of \$16,020,000 and PFD and coordination project concept note financing tables updated accordingly.

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments 4.19.23: Financing tables are aligned with guidelines.

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

4.19.23: Financing tables are aligned with guidelines.

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

4.19.23: Financing tables are aligned with guidelines.

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

4.24.23: Child project concept review will be undertaken subsequent to initial PFD review.

5.15.23: Please, find some initial comments on Child Projects and Coordination Grant to be taken into account during preparation phase:

Indonesia

Project sites: Given the relatively high METT scores of the target PAs and the high level of funding, please ensure there is thorough review and consideration of site selection for this project, pathways to increase management effectiveness and sustainability, and the extent to which this project will be able to increase METT scores via targets.

Aside from the target PAs in Sumatera, where else will the project work (across key landscapes/corridors, key transit routes/points etc)? And how will selection/prioritization be made?

b.) baseline investments

Please ensure the project team includes considerable baseline of investments in wildlife/CWT in indonesia funded by USAID and USFWS, and consider including USAID in PPG consultations.

c.) integrated approach of child project and TOC

Please further elaborate the project's integrate approach and Theory Of Change and how it will contribute to the desired transformation and GEBs described in the WCD IP PFD and GEF-8 strategy. The current text is much too general and generic.

d.) Incremental reasoning: Please articulate an incremental reasoning for this project. Need clear GEF increment from the business-as-usual scenario via system transformation. Also, need clear and integrated plan for sustainability.

3.) alignment with global/regional frameworks

Increase detail of this description throughout and remove or reformulate generic statements/passages (such as "the project aims to achieve this long-term impacts through transformational change?") to instead describe the project's actual approach to transformation and alignment.

Annex 1: Indicative project overview table

Suggest using PPG to build from the bottom up a strong TOC for this project based on a situational analysis. This then should inform the project objective, outcomes and outputs that flow logically, contribute to achieving the project objective and are measurable. The current table seems like a collection of activities without clear anchoring back to a project-level TOC that is specific to the context in Indonesia.

For instance, once a situational analysis and TOC have been completed, suggest revising project objective based on this to shorten, clarify, and increase strategic focus. An objective statement shouldn't include the *how* of the project (e.g. no "by?" or "through?" statements). Instead it should clearly articulate the *what* the project intends to achieve as its objective.

Annex 2:

Component 3: IAS is included as an indicative activity, unclear why. Please redact and ensure that all activities are clearly aligned with the project's TOC and results framework.

Annex 2.2: To avoid confusion, suggest only using the word "ecosystem" to refer to an actual biologic/physical ecosystem, rather than a system of another variety.

Malawi

Country context: Please ensure that the project targets areas of the country that are of global biodiversity significance-this is a prerequisite (beyond what is stated as "targeted areas that are particularly threatened by environmental degradation" is a condition that is not limited to high biodiversity areas or targets).

Component 1: Given the focus of the Integrated Program and GEF-8 strategy is on systems-level change, please ensure that PA and HWC interventions are linked to national-level enabling environment/policy reform/improvement to support site-level activities.

Component 3: Ensure that the assumptions that link component 3 activities with wildlife conservation outcomes are clearly articulated the project design (rather than assumed) and are measured/monitored to enable adaptive management and ensure activities are contributing to the objective. Further, the Outcomes and Outputs for this (\$92 million dollar) component in the table do not sufficiently clarify in this regard.

Indicative project overview is generic making it challenging to understand the project and how these pieces contribute to a TOC. Suggest reworking starting with designing a strong TOC for the project based on data and situational analysis.

Mozambique

Country context: Suggest reworking the statement that begins with "the project envisages wildlife conservation by?" to be well aligned with the WCD-IP and project TOC, and results framework. It is currently quite generic.

Results 3.1 includes a "challenge grant" program. Please be sure to include in the CER, clear criteria for this grant program that are well aligned with the goal and objectives for the IP.

Indicative project overview: Suggest a redesign based on a strong TOC with a short, pithy and clear project objective, components and project outcomes.

Nepal

Core indicator: Given the focus of the site-based interventions are in the Terai Arc Landscape and much of the HWC happens not only within PAs, but between and outside PAs across the landscape we would expect a core indicator 4 target in addition to CI 1.

Please note that Nepal has been selected to participate in the GEF-8 Greening transportation infrastructure integrated program. The Nepal project will be implemented by the ADB with a focus on the Terai. Strongly suggest connecting with both the **ADB and the World Bank** as key collaborators and contributors to this project.

Project component 2 and incremental reasoning should include HWC/HTC prevention as well as "tolerance of?" (given the very high level of HWC fatalities in the landscape).

Philippines

c.) **TOC/GEBS:** This section needs clarification to better articulate and understand the TOC, integrated approach to system transformation and the expected GEBS from the

project. Please note that maintenance of ecosystem goods and services is not a central GEB for the WCD-IP.

d.) The incremental reasoning includes mention of a "small grants program". Please be sure to include in the CER, clear criteria for this grant program that are well aligned with the goal and objectives for the IP.

2.) Indicative project overview: Please note that the project Objective must be an objective OF the investment that will be made in IWT (e.g. disrupting IWT, increasing status of species and landscapes etc), rather than the current articulation of the objective which is just the investment itself. Similarly, the project outcomes must be actual outcomes of that component, rather than a statement that the activity was completed/done. These are critical design elements that point to a need to go back to basics with this design during PPG. Starting with the TOC, and working through a strong project design approach to ensure clear, impactful and measurable outcomes of this project.

Thailand

d.) Incremental reasoning: The incremental reasoning for this project must be further articulated, including the results framework and components.

Please include a clear Theory Of Change for this project.

Global coordination project

Please include clear prioritization and support for behavior change for demand reduction activities per WCD-IP design and previous IEO findings in this regard.**Indonesia**

Project sites: Given the relatively high METT scores of the target PAs and the high level of funding, please ensure there is thorough review and consideration of site selection for this project, pathways to increase management effectiveness and sustainability, and the extent to which this project will be able to increase METT scores via targets.

Aside from the target PAs in Sumatera, where else will the project work (across key landscapes/corridors, key transit routes/points etc)? And how will selection/prioritization be made?

b.) baseline investments

Please ensure the project team includes considerable baseline of investments in wildlife/CWT in indonesia funded by USAID and USFWS, and consider including USAID in PPG consultations.

c.) integrated approach of child project and TOC

Please further elaborate the project's integrate approach and Theory Of Change and how it will contribute to the desired transformation and GEBs described in the WCD IP PFD and GEF-8 strategy. The current text is much too general and generic.

d.) Incremental reasoning: Please articulate an incremental reasoning for this project. Need clear GEF increment from the business-as-usual scenario via system transformation. Also, need clear and integrated plan for sustainability.

3.) alignment with global/regional frameworks

Increase detail of this description throughout and remove or reformulate generic statements/passages (such as "the project aims to achieve this long-term impacts through transformational change?") to instead describe the project's actual approach to transformation and alignment.

Annex 1: Indicative project overview table

Suggest using PPG to build from the bottom up a strong TOC for this project based on a situational analysis. This then should inform the project objective, outcomes and outputs that flow logically, contribute to achieving the project objective and are measurable. The current table seems like a collection of activities without clear anchoring back to a project-level TOC that is specific to the context in Indonesia.

For instance, once a situational analysis and TOC have been completed, suggest revising project objective based on this to shorten, clarify, and increase strategic focus. An objective statement shouldn't include the *how* of the project (e.g. no "by?" or "through?" statements). Instead it should clearly articulate the *what* the project intends to achieve as its objective.

Annex 2:

Component 3: IAS is included as an indicative activity, unclear why. Please redact and ensure that all activities are clearly aligned with the project's TOC and results framework.

Annex 2.2: To avoid confusion, suggest only using the word "ecosystem" to refer to an actual biologic/physical ecosystem, rather than a system of another variety.

Malawi

Country context: Please ensure that the project targets areas of the country that are of global biodiversity significance-this is a prerequisite (beyond what is stated as "targeted areas that are particularly threatened by environmental degradation" is a condition that is not limited to high biodiversity areas or targets).

Component 1: Given the focus of the Integrated Program and GEF-8 strategy is on systems-level change, please ensure that PA and HWC interventions are linked to national-level enabling environment/policy reform/improvement to support site-level activities.

Component 3: Ensure that the assumptions that link component 3 activities with wildlife conservation outcomes are clearly articulated the project design (rather than assumed) and are measured/monitored to enable adaptive management and ensure activities are contributing to the objective. Further, the Outcomes and Outputs for this (\$92 million dollar) component in the table do not sufficiently clarify in this regard.

Indicative project overview is generic making it challenging to understand the project and how these pieces contribute to a TOC. Suggest reworking starting with designing a strong TOC for the project based on data and situational analysis.

Mozambique

Country context: Suggest reworking the statement that begins with "the project envisages wildlife conservation by?" to be well aligned with the WCD-IP and project TOC, and results framework. It is currently quite generic.

Results 3.1 includes a "challenge grant" program. Please be sure to include in the CER, clear criteria for this grant program that are well aligned with the goal and objectives for the IP.

Indicative project overview: Suggest a redesign based on a strong TOC with a short, pithy and clear project objective, components and project outcomes.

Nepal

Core indicator: Given the focus of the site-based interventions are in the Terai Arc Landscape and much of the HWC happens not only within PAs, but between and outside PAs across the landscape we would expect a core indicator 4 target in addition to CI 1.

Please note that Nepal has been selected to participate in the GEF-8 Greening transportation infrastructure integrated program. The Nepal project will be implemented by the ADB with a focus on the Terai. Strongly suggest connecting with both the **ADB and the World Bank** as key collaborators and contributors to this project.

Project component 2 and incremental reasoning should include HWC/HTC prevention as well as "tolerance of?" (given the very high level of HWC fatalities in the landscape).

Philippines

c.) **TOC/GEBS:** This section needs clarification to better articulate and understand the TOC, integrated approach to system transformation and the expected GEBS from the

project. Please note that maintenance of ecosystem goods and services is not a central GEB for the WCD-IP.

d.) The incremental reasoning includes mention of a "small grants program". Please be sure to include in the CER, clear criteria for this grant program that are well aligned with the goal and objectives for the IP.

2.) Indicative project overview: Please note that the project Objective must be an objective OF the investment that will be made in IWT (e.g. disrupting IWT, increasing status of species and landscapes etc), rather than the current articulation of the objective which is just the investment itself. Similarly, the project outcomes must be actual outcomes of that component, rather than a statement that the activity was completed/done. These are critical design elements that point to a need to go back to basics with this design during PPG. Starting with the TOC, and working through a strong project design approach to ensure clear, impactful and measurable outcomes of this project.

Thailand

d.) Incremental reasoning: The incremental reasoning for this project must be further articulated, including the results framework and components.

Please include a clear Theory Of Change for this project.

Global coordination project

Please include clear prioritization and support for behavior change for demand reduction activities per WCD-IP design and previous IEO findings in this regard.

Agency's Comments

We look forward to receiving any comments on concept notes and working collaboratively with GEF Agencies during PPG phase to support strong alignment of country projects to the program framework.

5/16/23:

Thank you for these comments. We will convey them to the respective agencies to ensure that they are taken into account during preparation of the child projects.

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 4.24.23: PPG table has been properly filled and is consistent with finance tables.

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

4.24.23: Country STAR allocations are properly identified.

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

N/A

Agency's Comments

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

4.23.23: Co-financing: Please, adjust the classification categories as follows:

Public investment is normally classified as ?investment mobilized? . Please, revise the items below which are classified as ?recurrent expenditures?, and change them to ?investment mobilized?.

Recipient Country	ANAC	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	6,710,214.00
Government				

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Tourism, wildlife and Antiquities	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	3,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Uganda Wildlife Authority	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	7,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	National Forest Authority (NFA)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	District Local governments	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	19,000,000.00

- "Grant" is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please, revise the item below which is classified as "recurrent expenditures", and change it to "investment mobilized".

GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00
------------	------	-------	------------------------	------------

- "In-kind" is normally classified as "recurrent expenditure". Please, revise the items below which are classified as "investment mobilized", and change them to "recurrent expenditures".

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	In-kind	Investment mobilized	4,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Energy, Hydropower and Hydrocarbons	In-kind	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Maritime Economy	In-kind	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Handcrafts	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Private Sector	Diwasi Park Management	In-kind	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Non NOBIS	In-kind	Investment mobilized	200,000.00

Civil Society Organization	IFAW	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Civil Society Organization	IUCN	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Donor Agency	USAID-Biodiversity for resilience (B4R)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Uganda Conservation Foundation	In-kind	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Giraffe Conservation Foundation	In-kind	Investment mobilized	50,000.00
Civil Society Organization	AWF	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	Investment mobilized	23,458,064.00
Civil Society Organization	WWF Colombia	In-kind	Investment mobilized	2,926,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Panthera Colombia	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,043,000.00

- IUCN is GEF agency and co-implementing agency. Please change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?GEF agency?.

Civil Society Organization	IUCN	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
----------------------------	------	---------	----------------------	--------------

5.15.23: Please, at PIF stage all co-financiers have to be identified ? otherwise, please remove them from the table.

Private Sector	Nature-based tourism companies, technology companies	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Private Sector	Grant to various private sector stakeholders	Grant	Investment mobilized	19,000,000.00

11.2.23: Please replace ?Civil Society Organization? to ?GEF agency? for the two institutions below:

Civil Society Organization	World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)	Grant	Investment mobilized	7,200,000.00
Civil Society Organization	IUCN	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00

Agency's Comments

Co-financing categories have been confirmed with GEF Agencies supporting country projects and updated in the portal co-financing tables accordingly. Inconsistencies

between public investment/in-kind and investment mobilized/recurrent coding have been corrected.

IUCN is no longer listed as an executing entity for the Uganda country project, so the co-financing is retained as CSO co-financing, which reflects the nature of the co-financing in the project.

WB 5/16/23:

The estimated co-financing contributions (affecting Mexico and the Global Coordination Project) have been updated in the Portal and concept notes to reflect specific co-financiers, or omitted where a specific co-financier is not yet confirmed. The overall co-financing at program level has accordingly gone down at PFD stage. These co-financing opportunities will be progressed further during the PPG phase.

WB 11.7.23:

We changed the category for WWF and IUCN from 'Civil Society Organization' to 'GEF Agency'. Specifically, WWF was updated to the GEF Agency in the Mozambique concept note and IUCN in the Uganda concept note.

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

4.24.23: Endorsement letters are aligned with guidelines.

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

4.24.23: Endorsement letters have been uploaded to the GEF Portal. The review team created an Excel file with a comparison of the information found in the Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) *vis-?-vis* the information in Portal. The file has been sent to the Agency by e-mail message. The review detected inconsistencies in the figures on the LoEs and the financing tables. The financial information needs to be carefully reviewed considering the guidance provided, *as well as* the figures that allow the submission to go

through ? this means that consistency between what it is presented in the LoEs with those figures that allowed the submission included in the Sources of Funding is required. Please, revise and adjust, particularly for Ethiopia, Kenya, Guinea, Mexico and Indonesia.

5.15.23: In relation to the LoEs, please, check the following:

- o Ethiopia LoE is still the one signed by the previous OFP while the new OFP took office on 10th April 2023 and the PFD was first submitted on 12th April 2023. Name of executing entity in LoE still is different from child project in Portal. Title of child project still differs between LOE and Portal.
- o Kenya LoE is not yet signed.
- o Guinea LoE still show different focal area sources of funds numbers from Portal.
- o Mexico LoE still show different focal area sources of funds numbers from Portal. Name of executing entity in LOE still is different from child project in Portal.

Agency's Comments

The following changes have been made in the portal:

- Colombia, Malawi and Thailand:** project titles and/or Executing Partners have been updated to match LOEs.
- Uganda and Zambia:** updated LOEs have been uploaded and financing and Executing Partners updated to match LOEs.
- Ethiopia and Indonesia:** For both countries the oversubscription issues have been resolved without requiring change in original financing. The financing in the portal has been updated to reflect the original LOE financing. A new LOE is pending for Ethiopia with the signature of the new OFP and will be uploaded to the portal by 15 May.
- Guinea, Kenya and Mexico:** New LOEs are pending. New LOEs that reflect the portal financing figures have been requested by supporting GEF Agencies and will be uploaded to the portal by 15 May.

In addition, minor rounding reductions of country project financing to enable portal submission (i.e. rounding reductions of \$1-\$3) have been confirmed with GEF Agencies supporting affected country projects (Eswatini, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Malawi, Nepal, Paraguay, Thailand, Uganda and Zambia). Per GEF Sec guidance, new LOEs will not be required in these situations where the only LOE discrepancy is the minor rounding reduction, and this has been communicated to supporting GEF Agencies.

WB 5/16/23:

Updated LoEs for Kenya, Mexico, Guinea and Ethiopia are uploaded. Child project titles for Ethiopia and Mexico now align.

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

Secretariat's Comments 4.24.23: Endorsement letters are aligned with guidelines.

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 4.19.23: Maps and geo-referenced maps have been provided.

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 N/A

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

4.24.23: Please, check the comments above and resubmit for further review. Thanks!

5.15.23: Please, there are still some minor comments above to be addressed. Thanks!

11.2.23: Please, address the minor comments on CEO Endorsement deadline, Core indicators and co-financing above and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency's Comments 11.7.23: We addressed all comments indicated by GEF Sec. **10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.**

Secretariat's Comments 4.24.23: Child project concept review will be undertaken subsequent to initial PFD review.

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		5/5/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		5/16/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		11/7/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		