

# Development of an enabling environment for sustainable businesses based on the native biodiversity of Ecuador

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10219

**Countries**

Ecuador

**Project Name**

Development of an enabling environment for sustainable businesses based on the native biodiversity of Ecuador

**Agencies**

CAF

**Date received by PM**

6/17/2021

**Review completed by PM**

10/22/2021

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

10/26/2021

The project component *Monitoring and Evaluation* is missing the expected outcomes and outputs. Please include these in Table B.

Monitoring & Evaluation	Technical Assistance			GET	133,070.00	200,000.00
Monitoring & Evaluation	Technical Assistance			GET	133,070.00	200,000.00

12/9/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

11/22/2021

Included in Table B and the PRODOC. Changes are highlighted in yellow.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

In-kind cofinancing should be classified as recurrent expenditures, not investment mobilized. Please revise.

9/13/2021

Given the explanation below these should be characterized as investment mobilized but not as in-kind as these are actual funds. So they are either a grant or loans. Please revise.

9/21/2021

There is still a problem with the presentation of cofinancing. Investment mobilized is grants or loans. In-kind would be characterized as recurrent expenditure. Please revise accordingly.

---

Recipient Country Government

Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition

In-kind

9/22/2021

The issue identified above with the presentation of cofinancing has not been corrected in the revised submission. Please revise as in-kind should be characterized as recurrent expenditures.

9/27/2021

The issued identified above going back to 9/13 has still not been addressed. Please revise and resubmit.

10/26/2021

On the co-financing from **Ethniessence**: As per the co-financing letter, the amount of \$112,900 will be provided in the form of in-kind co-financing. Please request the agency to correct the type of co-financing in Table C from *Grant* to *In-Kind* and from *Investment Mobilized* to *Recurrent Expenditure*.

On behalf of ETHNIESSENCE CIA LTDA, I am pleased to commit USD 112,900 in-kind cofinancing in support of the project, "**Development of an enabling environment for sustainable businesses based on the native biodiversity of Ecuador**". This amount corresponds to all the technical work involving de research and development of new products; technical and administrative work of educating the members of all the productive chain,

On the co-financing from **Agrocalidad ? Ministry of Agriculture** and **MIPRO**: The two co-financing letters were provided in Spanish and we were not able to locate translations to English for both. Please submit the translated documents.

On the description in the portal on how Investment Mobilized was identified, please include descriptive information on how all the co-financing, categorized as Investment Mobilized, was identified. Currently what is missing is an explanation of how IM was identified that came from the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition.

12/1/2021

Cleared.

12/9/2021

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

11/21/2021

Changed and corrected. Changes are highlighted in **yellow**.

10/11/2021

The presentation of cofinancing has been corrected.

09/20/2021

The contributions from Ethniessence and COPROBICH were changed to grant in Table C of the CEO ER and Table 12 of the PRODOC. Changes are highlighted in yellow.

09/07/2021

There are two cases in which In-Kind cofinancing was reported as investment mobilized:

Ethniessence (USD 112,900) and COPROBICH (USD 85,197). These resources correspond to funds from these companies that will be channelled to support the project. These are not recurrent expenditures, but actual investment from the companies. Though the resources will be managed by themselves (i.e., in-kind).

Please advise if they must be marked as 'recurrent expenditures'.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

The ratio of GEF support and cofinancing support to project management costs should be similar to the ratio of GEF support to cofinancing for the entire project. Please revise.

9/13/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

09/07/2021

Adjusted. Changes in table B of CEO-ER and Table 11 of PRODOC highlighted in red.

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2021

The portal submission noted that a more detailed analysis will be available by July 2021 but we can not locate that report. The table is also confusing in the sense that it shows different compromised amounts.

Please clarify in the revised submission.

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

Currently, the use of the PPG is the following:

	USD		USD
Amount Approved:	100,000.00	Managed Amount:	100,000.00
Solicited amount:	100,000.00	Compromised:	94,500.00
Compromised amount:	19,875.00	Disbursed:	74,625.00
Resources available:	5,500.00	Remaining to disburse:	25,375.00

A more detailed report will be send to the GEF on July 2021.

12/1/2021

Please insert the utilization summary in the portal and do not refer to an Annex. Please submit a simple table as was done before, but make sure it is accurate. The report can be appended but a summary table is a requirement for the portal submission.

12/9/2021

Please make sure the table fits within the margins as we ask for any table that you enter into the portal.

12/13/2021

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

12/10/2021

An extract of the Report of PPG use, and the required summary table (that fits within the margins), have been put in the portal.

12/2/2021

An extract of the Report of PPG use, and the required summary table, have been put in the portal.

11/22/2021

Report of PPG use has been uploaded as project annex

#### Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

No.

Indicator 4.1 was 7,000 hectares at PIF and it is now zero. Please revise and explain.

Indicator 3 on restoration was zero at PIF and is now 18,500 hectares. Please revise and explain.

Annex A and the project results framework includes numerous hectare indicators (including indicators 2, 15, 16) that are not reflected in the core indicators report. Please revise so there is no inconsistency.

Finally, as all the resources for this project are coming from the biodiversity focal area, and the project is aligned with the biodiversity mainstreaming objective of the GEF, we expect the majority of hectares that are benefitting to fall under the biodiversity related

subindicators under Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, noncertified) OR Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations (certified) OR Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided.

10/26/2021

- Core Indicator Table has GEF Core Indicators 9 (chemicals reduced) clicked and the targets are zeroes. It seems like this is an operator error as the project is not geared towards producing this outcome. Please include targets and explain the rationale, or delete the the Indicators by reflecting it in the portal submission.

- Please include GEF Core Indicators and the targets for each in Annex A ?Project Results Framework?

12/1/2021

Please delete core indicator 9 entirely. It is still highlighted in the portal with a target of zero hectares.

The GEF core indicator and their targets should be linked and embedded in the relevant components in the project results framework where these outcomes will be achieved not just added as extra rows at the bottom of the table.

Finally, please reframe the project objective which should read in English as "To create basic conditions in Ecuador that facilitate the development of businesses that sustainably use biodiversity". Objective should framed in this way, as opposed to an outcome statement as it currently presented.

12/9/2021

This item that was mentioned previously was not addressed:

The GEF core indicator and their targets should be linked and embedded in the relevant components in the project results framework where these outcomes will be achieved not just added as extra rows at the bottom of the table.

The revised submission has the indicators just listed at the bottom of the table, but they should be placed within the components that will deliver these indicators.

12/13/2021

Cleared.



## Agency Response

12/02/2021

\*CAF asked help from the GEF's technological support team in order to delete core indicator 9. It is an error that cannot be fixed by CAF in the portal.

\*The objective has been fixed in the portal.

\*Core indicators were not directly linked to specific outcomes. This is why we had included them at the end of the results framework. Therefore, we have included the core indicators at the objective level, to capture that all the outcomes contribute to achieve them.

\* Regarding, "reframing the objective", it has been done.

11/22/2021

Core indicator 9 is not applicable, this was a typing mistake that has been corrected

Core indicators included into project results framework.

09/07/2021

1) Regarding indicator 4.1. This was a typing mistake in the portal. There is no contribution to indicator 3. The correct figure is:

Indicator 4. PIF stage 7,000 Endorsement 18,500

Indicator 4.1. PIF stage 2,000 Endorsement 2,500

Indicator 4.3. PIF stage 5,000 Endorsement 16,000

The figures in the Annex F file are correct.

2) Regarding Annex A and project results framework.

Indicator 2 of the project results framework correspond to indicator 4.3 of the core indicators. That is, 16,000 h under production systems.

Indicators 15 and 16 contribute to project indicator 2 / core indicator 4.3. These are targets set to each individual demonstration business.

Please refer to Annex 9 of the PRODOC. It has the details about measuring the core indicators. In the case of 4.1. it includes the sum of:

- a). Surface of reserves sponsored by Wikiri.
- b). Surface of morti?o harvesting areas certified organic by Sumak Mikuy.

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
Child Project

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Please summarize stakeholder engagement that took place during the design phase.

9/13/2021

There is no summary of the stakeholder engagement that took place during the design phase. What is presented is the results of a stakeholder analysis, but no discussion is presented of the stakeholder engagement that took place in the design phase with regards to the actual design of the project and the participation of stakeholders in that design process. Please provide this information in the portal submission and do not refer to text in the project document or annexes in the project document.

9/21/2021

The actual text has to be entered in the CEO endorsement request, per normal procedures, not as an attached Annex. It only need by a summary of the discussions undertaken.

9/27/2021

The presentation in the portal is adequate. Full description provided in the Annex. Cleared.

Agency Response

09/20/2021

The document "**Summary of stakeholder engagement during the design phase**" was uploaded to the portal.

09/07/2021

Please refer to section 3 of the Stakeholder Analysis (Annex 7 of the PRODOC).

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Please provide Annex E in the correct format and we suggest that CAF follow the format that was used for project ID 10295 as opposed to submitting every GEF project with a different format for Annex E. Please do not reference a "budget note" in the table either, which was not done in Annex E for project ID 10295.

Please provide a justification and explanation for the \$9000 vehicle identified in the project budget and that appears to be paid for entirely by GEF.

9/13/2021

Budget presentation revised correctly. Cleared.

Vehicle purchases are justified and cleared.

10/26/2021

The table is slightly off margins, please submit a budget table that fits the margins.



Items will be covered by COPROBON			
Equipment and office furniture (e.g. computers, printers, desks)	10,000	10,000	10,000
<b>Utilities</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>
Bureau Office: Utilities for extension agents. Maintenance, minor repairs and operation costs will be covered by Bureau Office.	4,000	4,000	4,000
Bureau Office: Heating, water, electricity, telephone, Internet, etc. and other operation costs will be covered by Bureau Office.	5,000	5,000	5,000
<b>Goods - subject to</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>
Contingency fund for selected research activities of communities in small groups (linked to environment and natural resources) USD 1 500 per group x 20 groups	200,000	200,000	200,000
<b>Subcontracted consulting &amp; study</b>			<b>140,000</b>
Project evaluation services. Contract with Fundación Heifer			140,000
<b>Contractual services - staff salaries</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>
Gender specialist to prepare draft a conceptual framework about gender equality in communities to be engaged with GEMME in a working group	7,500	7,500	7,500
Provision of mobile training centers for months and days. The cost will be the responsibility of the mobile training centers for the Center with - Caracas and Guatopo - Guatopo National Park	2,500	2,500	2,500

Financial audits have been charged to components as has the Administrative and Financial Officer, supplies, landline and software licenses. Please use the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC to cover these costs.

		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Maintenance and operation of project website (outsourced)		32,000	32,000	32,000				
Annual financial audits, USD 10,000/year		40,000	40,000	40,000				
Prepare and edit learning documents (three documents). The doc								
Maintenance and operation of project website (outsourced)		32,000	32,000	32,000				
Annual financial audits, USD 10,000/year		40,000	40,000	40,000				
Prepare and edit learning documents (three documents). The doc								
Communication specialist: Time allocation to this outcome	22,500	22,500	22,500	22,500	90,000			90,000
Administrative and financial officer: Time allocated to this outcome	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	108,000			108,000
<b>Training, workshops, meeti ngs</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>147,000</b>	<b>64,100</b>	<b>235,100</b>	<b>25,970</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>260,170</b>
Communication specialist: Time allocation to this outcome	22,500	22,500	22,500	22,500	90,000			90,000
Administrative and financial officer: Time allocated to this outcome	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	108,000			108,000
<b>Training, workshops, meeti ngs</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>147,000</b>	<b>64,100</b>	<b>235,100</b>	<b>25,970</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>260,170</b>
<b>Office supplies</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,200</b>
Sundry supplies (e.g., paper, printer cartridges, markers) 200 per year per outcome	800	800	800	800	3,200			3,200
<b>Other operating costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,200</b>
Landline and mobile communications. Landline USD 100/month.				9,600	9,600			9,600
Mobile phone service USD 100/month.				1,600	1,600			1,600
Annual fees for software licenses (e.g., video conference, office).				1,600	1,600			1,600
<b>Office supplies</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,200</b>
Sundry supplies (e.g., paper, printer cartridges, markers) 200 per year per outcome	800	800	800	800	3,200			3,200
<b>Other operating costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,200</b>
Landline and mobile communications. Landline USD 100/month.				9,600	9,600			9,600
Mobile phone service USD 100/month.				1,600	1,600			1,600
Annual fees for software licenses (e.g., video conference, office).				1,600	1,600			1,600

12/1/2021

Cleared.

## Agency Response

11/22/2021

Included. The table fits the margins.

-Financial audits and administrative and financial officer were charged to PMC.

Regarding supplies, it is requested to keep them charged to each component since they will be direct inputs to field activities. Regarding communications and software licences it is requested to maintain their cost into outcome 4 which includes learning and good practice since these items will be essential to support this work.

09/07/2021

The budget table was detailed as requested. It is Annex 4 of the PRODOC.

The vehicles will be donated to Sumak Mikuy to strengthen and expand technical assistance to smallholding farmers. The vehicles are:

One motorbike for extension agent. Maintenance, insurance and operation costs will be covered by Sumak Mikuy. USD4,000.

One walking tractor to service farmers. Maintenance, insurance and operation costs will be covered by Sumak Mikuy. USD5,000.

### **Project Results Framework**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared. As noted above please ensure consistency between the project results framework and the associated hectare indicators with the core indicators.

9/13/2021

Cleared.

## Agency Response

09/07/2021

Done.

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Report provided, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/14/2021

No. Please revise in response to all comments provided above and resubmit.

9/13/2021

No. Please revise in response to all comments provided above and resubmit.

9/21/2021

No. Please revise in response to all comments provided above and resubmit.

9/22/2021

No. The same issue that was identified on 9/21/2021 remains to be resolved. Please correct the characterization of the cofinancing as instructed above under cofinancing and resubmit.

9/27/2021

No.

There is still a problem with the presentation of cofinancing. Investment mobilized is grants or loans. In-kind would be characterized as recurrent expenditure. Please revise accordingly.

Recipient Country Government

Ministry of Environment, Water  
and Ecological Transition

**10/26/2021**

**Please address the remaining issues identified above and resubmit.**

**12/2/2021**

**No, there are still issues from the last review in October that have not been properly addressed. Please revise ASAP and resubmit.**

**12/9/2021**

**No. Please see above regarding:**

**1) PPG budget table is outside the margins of the table.**

**2) Core indicators should be placed within the components where these core indicators will be delivered.**

**12/13/2021**

**Cleared. CEO endorsement is recommended.**

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>7/14/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/13/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/22/2021</b>	

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/27/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/13/2021</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**