

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

Review PIF 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

Agenices

CAF

Date received by PM

4/23/2019

Review completed by PM

11/15/2019

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes, the project is aligned with BD 1-1, Biodiversity Mainstreaming in Priority Sectors.

Agency Response No further comments.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Please clarify if under Component Two, the project will fund other biodiversity-based businesses through the innovation fund and green finance lines. If yes, please present the criteria by which these businesses and their business ideas will be evaluated to ensure the generation of global environmental benefits for businesses that receive funding.

We understand the proposal seeks to provide two types of financial instruments for businesses based on the sustainable use of native biodiversity: (i) green lines (debt instruments) and (ii) equity through an innovation fund.

On the debt instruments: please confirm that the debt instruments would be designed with grants -also part of this project- and that the selection criteria of biodiversity financing will be responding to GEF core indicators. Local banks i.e. Banco Pichincha, Banco del Pacifico will receive technical cooperation to design financial products that respond to the needs of these specific businesses, and will then onlend to these businesses with the non-grant loan instrument from the GEF.

Please clarify what you meant by *seed funding* in point (iv) below. Usually seed funding is understood as equity; so please elaborate why you would need equity from the GEF (instead of loans) for the lines of financing.

38. GEF funds will be used to develop specific credit lines to support biodiversity businesses (output 3.2). STAR resources will be invested (i) to design the credit instruments and financial products, (ii) to develop guidelines and operational procedures, and (iii) to train personnel from financial institutions and (iv) to provide seed funding for the credit lines[1]. Resources will be dedicated to standard credit to ongoing businesses and venture capital to aid start-ups. Direct work with financial institutions will facilitate that existing green lines are adapted to include biodiversity-based enterprises[2].

On the equity instruments, the support of the GEF in the form of equity for the creation of an innovation fund, would need much more details on the fund structure, strategy, governance and fund manager before we agree to support that fund.

A general comment is that the proposal does not provide in depth analysis of why these two specific instruments are the adequate ones to address the financing barrier for biodiversity businesses.

Regarding Component three please clarify in the text what the outcomes of these businesses will be from a global biodiversity benefits perspective and what the project will monitor and measure in this regard and how this links to the GEF core indicators.

Additional comments after responses received on November 6 2019

After review of the responses the GEF suggests to focus on the on-lending instruments (green lines of credit) only through local banks. The information provided on the equity investment i.e. that the fund viability is to be analysed during the project preparation phase; is not enough to support these activities at this stage. The GEF support for equity investments, as mentioned in the comments provided on October 24, require details on the fund structure, strategy, governance and fund manager before we agree to support that fund.

Additional Comment on November 8

Please delete mentioning to resources of the GEF going to venture capital as we are not supporting the innovation fund.

In paragraph 40 : "resources will be dedicated to standard credit to ongoing businesses and venture capital to aid start-ups."

Comments were addressed in the November 9 version: Cleared.

Agency Response

november 6, 2019.

GEF comments: Please clarify if under Component Two, the project will fund other biodiversity-based businesses through the innovation fund and green finance lines. If yes, please present the criteria by which these businesses and their business ideas will be evaluated to ensure the generation of global environmental benefits for businesses that receive funding.

CAF answer: Yes, the project is expected to catalyse funding for a range of biodiversity-based businesses. As indicated on footnote 13, the criteria to be applied will be developed during the project preparation phase. The starting point will be the assessment tool that is currently used by Banco del Pacífico which was developed through CAF's technical cooperation assistance. This tool covers seven topics: (i) biodiversity conservation, (ii) use of biodiversity, (iii) benefit sharing, (iv) economic efficiency, (v) fulfilment of national regulations and international agreements, (vi) stakeholder rights (e.g., human rights, gender, indigenous people rights), (vii) clear land tenure and natural resources use rights. The above-mentioned tool (in Spanish) is attached to the PIF.

Footnote 13 has been expanded to include this information.

GEF comments: We understand the proposal seeks to provide two types of financial instruments for businesses based on the sustainable use of native biodiversity: (i) green lines (debt instruments) and (ii) equity through an innovation fund.

CAF answer: It is proposed to provide two types of credit instruments: (i) green lines for ongoing businesses and start-ups and (ii) an innovation fund to finance investments into research and development. Both are debt instruments, but for the innovation fund it is proposed to analyse the use of equity during the project preparation phase.

GEF comments: On the debt instruments: please confirm that the debt instruments would be designed with grants -also part of this project- and that the selection criteria of biodiversity financing will be responding to GEF core indicators. Local banks i.e. Banco Pichincha, Banco del Pacífico will receive technical cooperation to design financial products that respond to the needs of these specific businesses, and will then on lend to these business with the non-grant loan instrument from the GEF.

CAF answer: The project will solely use GEF grant resources. The initial idea was to have a complementing non-grant project, but this has been discarded. The references to GEF non-grant resources have been crossed out in the text.

The GEF grant resources will be used:

1. To design / enhance debt instruments and to develop capacities in the financial institutions. The selection criteria to be applied will contribute to biodiversity conservation with emphasis on global benefits and in line with GEF core indicators.

2. To mobilise private capital for the credit lines and the innovation fund. That is, the GEF resources will be a kind of “blended finance” to mitigate risks and catalyse other investments into the credit lines. The GEF contribution will be complemented with resources from CAF (e.g., green bonds see <https://www.caf.com/en/currently/news/2018/08/new-issue-of-caf-green-bonds-to-foster-sustainable-development-in-latin-america/>), the local banks and other sources (e.g., Finance in Motion) to be secured during the PPG.

3. To provide initial funding to setup the innovation fund. This is proposed to be a revolving fund to be sustained with the proceeds.

GEF comments: Please clarify what you meant by seed funding in point (iv) below. Usually seed funding is understood as equity; so please elaborate why you would need equity from the GEF (instead of loans) for the lines of financing.

38. GEF funds will be used to develop specific credit lines to support biodiversity businesses (output 3.2). STAR resources will be invested (i) to design the credit instruments and financial products, (ii) to develop guidelines and operational procedures, and (iii) to train personnel from financial institutions and (iv) to provide seed funding for the credit lines [1]. Resources will be dedicated to standard credit to ongoing businesses and venture capital to aid start-ups. Direct work with financial institutions will facilitate that existing green lines are adapted to include biodiversity-based enterprises [2].

CAF answer: The term “seed funding” was used to refer to initial funding to establish the revolving innovation fund. To avoid confusion the term “seed funding” has been replaced in the text.

GEF comments: On the equity instruments, the support of the GEF in the form of equity for the creation of an innovation fund, would need much more details on the fund structure, strategy, governance and fund manager before we agree to support that fund.

CAF answer: The viability of using equity in the innovation fund to be analysed during the project preparation phase. CORPEI uses equity to support the development of enterprises that otherwise will be considered to be of high risk and therefore have limited access to standard financial resources.

GEF comments: A general comment is that the proposal does not provide in depth analysis of why these two specific instruments are the adequate ones to address the financing barrier for biodiversity businesses.

CAF answer: During PIF preparation entrepreneurs and financial institutions agreed that access to financial resources was a major barrier. On the one hand, these non-conventional enterprises are considered high-risk and therefore cannot easily access resources to start or expand the business. On the other hand, credit for research and development is practically negligible. More detailed analyses of the limiting factors and barriers will be done during the project preparation phase.

GEF comments: Regarding Component three please clarify in the text what the outcomes of these businesses will be from a global biodiversity benefits perspective and what the project will monitor and measure in this regard and how this links to the GEF core indicators.

CAF answer: New paragraph 50 has been added.

NOVEMBER 8, 2019

All the mentions about equity and the innovation fund were deleted from the proposal.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Please note that in-kind resources can not be characterized as investment mobilized but would be under recurrent expenditures. Please revise.

November 8, 2019

Adequate adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF comments: Please note that in-kind resources can not be characterized as investment mobilized but would be under recurrent expenditures. Please revise.

CAF answer: In kind contributions from beneficiaries has been listed as recurrent expenditures.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

No. Please clarify the methodology used and justification for the hectare coverage for the pilot interventions.

November 8, 2019

Adequate clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response The surface correspond to the area of the sites where mortiño is collected by the members of the Union of Farmer and Indigenous Organizations of Cotacachi plus the area of the sites where community groups in Bunche collect caña leaves to supply LeafPacks plus the area of reedbeds and caña plantations where farmers harvest caña to supply construction materials.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

The project elucidates a clear problem statement and the barriers that exist for the successful development of biodiversity-based businesses that is one response to biodiversity loss at a general level, but the project does not explicitly identify the causes of biodiversity loss in the three pilot areas and does not explain why these three businesses have been chosen as a response to reducing or eliminating the threats to globally important biodiversity in these intervention areas. Please clarify.

In addition, under component two, please clarify whether the innovation fund/green financing lines will support any other businesses besides the pilot interventions, and if yes, how will the project ensure that any business supported by the innovation fund/green financing lines represent an appropriate response to biodiversity loss in the area where these businesses will operate.

November 8, 2019

Adequate clarification provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF comments The project elucidates a clear problem statement and the barriers that exist for the successful development of biodiversity-based businesses that is one response to biodiversity loss at a general level, but the project does not explicitly identify the causes of biodiversity loss in the three pilot areas and does not explain why these three businesses have been chosen as a response to reducing or eliminating the threats to globally important biodiversity in these intervention areas. Please clarify.

CAF answers: For causes of biodiversity loss please see paragraph 22.

For how the businesses were chosen, during PIF preparation MAE's current information about operating business initiatives was used to identify small and medium size enterprises that had been operating for at least five years and had a clear contribution to conservation of native biodiversity. Finally, it was decided to select a private enterprise (i.e., farmed frogs and caña leaf plates), a community-based enterprise (i.e., mortifño) and a public-private enterprise (i.e., caña construction materials). This was done to be able to have lessons from the three types of business models.

GEF comments: In addition, under component two, please clarify whether the innovation fund/green financing lines will support any other businesses besides the pilot interventions, and if yes, how will the project ensure that any business supported by the innovation fund/green financing lines represent an appropriate response to biodiversity loss in the area where these businesses will operate.

CAF answers: Yes. The green credit lines and the innovation fund will be open to everyone through the corresponding financial institutions. Training of bank officers will contribute to safeguard that the credit support biodiversity conservation. For this purpose, the project will facilitate the development of guidelines and operations procedures and training of pertinent personnel. And the design of MRV systems for the green credit lines.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

No, please elaborate more on the baseline for each of three pilot interventions.

The general baseline for biodiversity finance in Ecuador is adequately elaborated.

November 8, 2019

Adequate elaboration of baseline of pilot intervention areas. Cleared.

Please elaborate this more comprehensively by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response Baseline information for each of the pilot supply chains is found in paragraphs 22 and 43 to 46.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

No.

Please also elaborate on the alternative scenario for the three pilot interventions and what will be generated in each in terms of global environmental benefits in the pilot area geographies and link this to the appropriate GEF core indicators.

November 8, 2019

Adequate clarification on the alternative scenario. Cleared.

Please elaborate more comprehensively by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response Included, please see paragraph 28.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes, at a general level this is addressed and particularly at the national level. Given that the project has pre-identified three pilot businesses for investment, please describe the incremental cost reasoning for these ongoing businesses.

November 11, 2019

Adequate explanation at PIF stage. Cleared.

Please elaborate more comprehensively by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response Included, please see paragraph 56.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2009

Please clarify how the project targets for the core indicators was derived from the actions of the three pilot interventions that will be funded and how the core indicators will be measured vis a vis the product lines of the three businesses. In short, draw the causal link between each of three businesses--assuming success--to the core indicator outcome associated with the product line of that business.

In addition, please discuss how other businesses funded through the innovation fund/green financing lines well contribute to global environmental benefits and how these will be measured going forward.

November 8, 2019

Adequate elaboration at PIF stage. Cleared.

Please provide more comprehensive explanations by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

GEF COMMENTS: Please clarify how the project targets for the core indicators was derived from the actions of the three pilot interventions that will be funded and how the core indicators will be measured vis a vis the product lines of the three businesses. In short, draw the causal link between each of three businesses--assuming success--to the core indicator outcome associated with the product line of that business.

CAF ANSWERS: The pilot interventions will contribute to two core indicators: (i) area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares) and (ii) number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment.

The mortiño and cañaIn addition, please discuss how other businesses funded through the innovation fund/green financing lines well contribute to global environmental benefits and how these will be measured going forward. guadua businesses will contribute to the first core indicator. For mortiño, the issuing of harvest permits, and the formalising of harvest plans will indicate the area under improved practices. For caña guadua, the area of reedbeds and plantations covered by the sustainable supply policies will indicate the area under improved practices.

For the second indicator, the information to be used is the number of persons that are part of the corresponding supply chain

GEF COMMENTS: In addition, please discuss how other businesses funded through the innovation fund/green financing lines well contribute to global environmental benefits and how these will be measured going forward.

CAF ANSWERS: At the moment it is not possible to identify how other businesses could contribute to GEF core indicators. However, it is foreseen that for each lender it is identified the main contribution to global benefits and to incorporate an indicator to measure this contribution. The web-based Exploring Natural Capital Opportunities, Risks and Exposure tool (ENCORE) could serve as a framework to assess the contribution to sustain natural capita assets and ecosystem services. This topic will be developed during the project preparation phase in collaboration with UNEPFI.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes. This project is extremely innovative and addresses a critical barrier to the sustainable use of biodiversity. Sustainability is embedded in the project design by fostering the creation of businesses that are financially viable. The model of funding support can help scale up the impact. Strengthening the enabling framework and conditions for biodiversity businesses to be successful by eliminating key barriers will also contribute to scaling up and sustainability.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes, at a general level. For the three pilot interventions, please elaborate on the gender context within these biodiversity-based production systems and businesses.

November 8, 2019

Adequate elaboration of gender context at this time. Cleared.

Please elaborate more fully by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Included, please see paragraphs 74 to 78.

NOVEMBER 8, 2019

Specific mentions about Social and gender mainstreaming in the frog farming pilot business activities were included. see paragraph 77 iii) The intervention about frog farming does integrate social aspects that can bring the following positive impacts: (a) Increased sources of formal labour; b) Change of Ecuadorian society in the way biodiversity-based products are perceived as an alternative source of income; and (c) Expansion of nutritious food sources for the Ecuadorian population and abroad. Regarding the Gender mainstreaming, during the execution it will be applied a gender-based approach, encouraging women to participate in amphibian-watching workshops and training courses. It should be emphasized that this can be difficult to carry out in communities where roles between women and men are clearly marked. In some communities, important decisions are made by women. For this reason, although many employment opportunities will be generated for men, women will be encouraged to participate in the different activities of the project. For instance, the inclusion of women in the tourist guidance activity in areas of influence of natural amphibian populations. At least 50% of participants are expected to attend training and action plan development workshops, and socialization events in the community are expected to be women.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes, private sector is a key stakeholder and this is discussed throughout the proposal.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes. Please delete the row that presents as a risk that unavailability of GEF Non-grant resources.

November 9, 2019

The risks table still includes the row that presents the risk of unavailability of GEF non-grant resources. Please delete.

November 9, 2019

Addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response Deleted
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes in very general terms.

Please briefly discuss the institutional arrangements for the actions in the three pilot intervention areas.

November 8, 2019

Adequate explanation provided. Cleared.

Agency Response See paragraph 85

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019

No. Please provide a more specific KM plan for this very unique project intervention. What is presented is just generic boiler plate language that could apply to any project.

November 11, 2019

Adequate at PIF stage. Cleared.

This project may identify some novel approaches to businesses based on sustainable use on biodiversity, therefore, please strengthen the KM plan by the time of CEO endorsement to ensure wide dissemination of good practice and lessons learned.

Agency Response This was slightly expanded. This topic will be fully developed during PPG.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 9, 2019

The LoE is now signed by the official GEF OFP, but the endorsed amounts in the letter are lower than the requested amounts in Portal.

The GEF amount in Tables A, B and D can’t be higher than \$3,102,753. The Agency Fee in Part I – Project Information and in Table D can’t be higher than \$279,248

Please revise accordingly and be sure to now check all budget figures in the document based on the changes made in response to this observation about the LOE.

November 14, 2019

The submission still has an issue of a lack of consistency between the Tables with budget data and the LOE. This has been conveyed to CAF through email with screen shots of the various tables.

Table E has a problem. In the LOE the OFP endorsed \$100,000 for PPG. CAF reduced the PPG amount to \$91,743. However, there is no additional PPG Fee because the endorsed Fee amount in the LOE all went to cover the fee of the GEF Project Financing (see LOE dated 11/13/2019). Consequently, CAF cannot request the PPG Fee of \$8,257 they are requesting in Portal.

CAF needs to amend this situation through either one of these three options:

- a- Reduce the GEF Project Financing Fee amount by \$8,257 and leave intact the Table E and Table D.
- b- Leave intact the GEF Financing Fee amount in Table D and eliminate the PPG Fee amount in Table E, increasing the PPG amount in Table E up to \$100,000, which will match the amounts endorsed by the GEF OFP in the LOE.
- c- Leave intact the figures in Portal in Tables D and E, but this will require a new LOE.

Agency Response

November 13, 2019

There is a new LoE uploaded in the GEF Portal, and the endorsed amounts match with the amounts in the Portal.

Tables A, B, C and D were revised and they are accurate now.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 24, 2019

No. Please submit the proposal when the call for proposals for the Non-grant Instrument is announced.

August 21, 2019

No. Please submit this proposal through the NGI window and be sure to tick the box in the portal for "NGI".

October 24, 2019

No. Please revise the PIF in response to the comments above and resubmit.

November 8, 2019

Please address the issue related to the risks table mentioned above and resubmit.

November 9, 2019

No. Please fix the issue with the LOE as indicated above. Please ensure that all budget numbers etc are accurate.

November 14, 2019

No. Please fix the issue with the LOE as indicated above. Please ensure that all budget numbers etc are accurate.

November 18, 2019

Yes. All issues related to the LOE have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 9, 2019

By the time of CEO Endorsement, the GEF Implementing Agency (CAF) needs to present: (i) a detailed explanation of the mechanism through which the Executing Entities will select the grant proposals and disburse the funds; and (ii) how GEF Implementing Agency (CAF) will ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements are met at all levels of the project implementation; and (iii) a legal establishment/mechanism on how the GEF fund is transferred to set up revolving funds, and how the new fund is to be operated with outflows/inflows of loans and credits.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval