



Restoration of Wetlands and other important Amazonian Ecosystems - Capacity-building, innovation, development and technological transfer for ecological restoration and climate change mitigation

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11167

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Restoration of Wetlands and other important Amazonian Ecosystems - Capacity-building, innovation, development and technological transfer for ecological restoration and climate change mitigation

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

11/16/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

No. The project does not fit with the GEF-8 biodiversity focal area strategy for a number of reasons that are presented in the review sheet. The project objective and overall design require revision, the PIF itself has to make a better case of how the project fits with the GEF-8 strategy, but most importantly it has to focus more on the delivery of global environmental benefits through wetland restoration in areas of high global biodiversity significance and less on plan development, creation of reports, establishing science panels, surveys, and protocol development and training without stronger investment and links to robust implementation. There are also concerns that this investment is not well-linked to a previous GEF investment (GEF ID 10706) with the same executing partner that is focused on sustainable management of the same target ecosystems.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/2023

The PIF has been totally revised. The alignment with the GEF-8 BD strategy is now clearer.

The revised PIF includes a table that illustrates the complementarity between project GEF ID 10706, and the proposed GEF-8 project. Please see section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project - GEF Funded Project" of the PIF.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Not adequately.

The project objective is currently stated: "The objective of this project is to establish an adequate policy and technical environment and an integrated strategic plan for restoration of wetland ecosystems in the Amazon mainland and coast to be considered as a Nature-based Solution with high climate change mitigation potential and important process for the conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of these critical ecosystems and their globally significant biodiversity."

A GEF-objective formulation should be as follows: "The objective of this project is to restore wetland ecosystems in the Amazon mainland and coast through strengthening capacity for wetland restoration, improving the enabling environment, and initiating restoration in XX hectares of the Amazon."

The rest of the summary will have to be revised once the revisions are undertaken to invest more in the actual implementation of restoration activities on a larger scale than is currently proposed. In addition, it identifies elements that are not in the project, such as "strengthening" public policies that does not show up elsewhere in the project, let alone an analysis of the existing policy baseline.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/2023

The project objective has been reformulated as requested.

Restoration activities have been enlarged, covering both passive and active restoration in productive and natural landscapes. The results framework has been revised accordingly.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

The project objective should be better formulated. Please consider using this or something with this kind of focus: "The objective of this project is to restore wetland ecosystems in the Amazon mainland and coast through strengthening capacity for wetland restoration, improving the enabling environment, and initiating restoration in XX hectares of the Amazon." The entire second part of the current objective is not useful: "to be considered as a Nature-based Solution with high climate change mitigation potential and important process for the conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of these critical ecosystems and their globally significant biodiversity" as it is widely accepted that wetland restoration is an NbS etc. This addition adds no value to the project objective.

The project summary notes that the project will strengthen public policies, but nowhere in the outcome do we see activities focused on the policy framework for wetland restoration. Please clarify.

Outcome 1 as formulated assumes the development of a Plan will lead to "improved conservation status" but practical experience in conservation shows us that plans do not lead to improved conservation status, thus the outcome should be reworded and end at stakeholders.

Outcome 2 is quite expensive to have as its main results only the training of 300 people. The outputs related to the community-based businesses do not make sense in

relation to the overall problem statement so this needs a clearer articulation and rationale presented or deletion, which is what we suggest.

Outcome 3 which is most related to the delivery of global environmental benefits is not ambitious enough given the problem statement and the importance that the project places on implementing wetland restoration in the Amazon. We recommend that the project be redesigned such that the significant enabling condition investments of outcomes one and two result in an ambitious area target for Outcome 3 as 1,650 hectares or restoration being undertaken is simply inadequate. Therefore, more resources have to be allocated to this component with a concomitant increase in ambition in terms of restoration undertaken in areas of global biodiversity significance. The total cost of this project including cofinance is USD\$ 40 million with a result that only 1,650 hectares are restored out of a potential of 5 million hectares (paragraph 21).

The project should cite a review of the literature that identifies the technical and operational gaps that exist with regards to wetland restoration in the Amazon that the project aims to address. Mangrove restoration projects and investments have been going on around the world for at least a half-century, with an extensive and rich literature complete with protocols, yet the PIF cites no research on work in the Amazon basin on restoration and what the technical gaps are, which is a basic premise of the entire project design.

11/23/2023

While there is an output on M&E, the GEF-8 Indicative Project Overview table has a complete component for M&E (see below) ? please ask include the M&E parts (outputs ? outcomes ? GEF resources) in the M&E component.

4. Project M&E, awareness raising and knowledge management	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 4.1. Communication and knowledge management in place.</p> <p><i>Expected indirect beneficiaries:</i> <i>Number of people reached out by the project communication outputs: 200,000.</i></p> <p>Outcome 4.2. Project implemented according to results-based management (RBM) principles.</p>	<p>4.1.1. Project's communication strategy developed and under implementation.</p> <p>4.1.2. Knowledge management plan developed and implemented.</p> <p>4.2.1. Project M&E system designed and operational.</p> <p>4.2.2. Project monitoring reports, mid-term review and terminal evaluation contribute to the successful delivery of the project.</p>	GET	198,000.00	1,507,815.00	
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)							
					Sub Total (\$)	4,770,000.00	38,961,905.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ							
					GET	230,000.00	1,948,095.00
					Sub Total(\$)	230,000.00	1,948,095.00
					Total Project Cost(\$)	5,000,000.00	40,910,000.00

11/24/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Points taken:

The project objective has been rephrased;

The results framework has been revised and improved;

Outcome 1 has been revised accordingly.;

The number of beneficiaries has been increased;

The results framework has been revised, and the expected GEBs have been adjusted.

Literature citations are detailed in footnotes throughout the PIF, as required.

The diverse problems faced by varzeas, lowland forests, and mangroves in the Amazon region are now well detailed in the Project Rationale Section of the PIF.

11/24/2023

Point taken and addressed. M&E component has been included and so the related outcome, outputs and resources.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

The project noted that gender equality considerations will be further developed in the PPG stage. Considering the importance of women in biodiversity value chain and agroforestry production in Amazonia (as stated in the project document), there will be need to engage women actively and reflect this in all the project components (i.e., capturing their knowledge and contributions, more than counting them in as participants/passive beneficiaries). Please revise PIF accordingly and be sure this is taken into consideration during the PPG phase.

11/16/2023

Please ensure that gender experts, women's organizations are represented in Output 1.1.3. Please integrate gender perspectives in Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. Output 4.2.2 should also reflect monitoring and reporting on gender-specific results.

11/24/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

The gender section has been revised, as requested.

11/24/2023

Point taken and addressed. Gender dimensions have been included. in the outputs and in the project description.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

a) No, as noted above too much money proportionally is being spent on plans, trainings, protocol development, etc and too little on actually initiation of restoration activities in areas of high biodiversity significance. Please revise accordingly.

Please describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified.

b) PMC request for GEF funds is above the FSP ceiling of 5% (actually it is 5.2%), while for the co-financing is only 3.6% - these percentages have to be proportional. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

The results framework and expected GEBs have been revised.

Investment Mobilized have been described.

PMC cost has been revised.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

4/23/2023

The project is not going to address deforestation, so all that information is not needed in the rationale section, please delete.

You can start the project rationale section with para 8.

The section on problems to be addressed and justification is disconnected from the project framework. The project has stated that the issue it wants to address is the lack of knowledge, protocols, capacity to implement wetland restoration in the Amazon. Yet, the problem statement is focused on the threats to the ecosystems in the Amazon, but the project is not addressing these threats.

Deforestation, fragmentation etc. and the underlying causes of these phenomena are not issues that the project will address although the project should discuss who is addressing these problems such that the restoration that is being implemented will have some chance at sustainability. Please revise accordingly.

The problem statement (starting at paragraph 13) should not begin with the pilot areas, but rather with a clear description of the gaps in knowledge and capacity that components one and two are focused on (starting around para 20). These should be supported by literature, particularly the identification of a lack of protocols and technologies for restoration in the target ecosystems. Paragraph 25 is totally absent any analysis or literature review of the experience in Brazil and this has to be revised with the appropriate analysis introduced in

this section such that the proposed solution can be justified. This is critical given that there is such a rich and longstanding literature on mangrove restoration globally and specifically in the Amazon writ large.

Please explain why these pilot areas were identified, and how they relate to the areas the same executing partner is implementing sustainable wetland management activities through a GEF-7 project.

The barriers description is very weak and not linked up to other parts of the text. Simply listing in bullet format what is lacking is not adequate or comprehensive enough articulation of the barriers to successful restoration in the Amazon basin. For example, the lack of a strategy is not a barrier. The main barrier that the project claims is the fact that the scientific and technological underpinnings for successful large-scale restoration do not exist. Please revise and provide a more sophisticated analysis of the barriers of successful restoration in the Amazon in these specific ecosystems, which appear to be mainly knowledge based. We note again that while policies were introduced as needing strengthening, nothing else has appeared in the document related to policies.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Well noted.

We have delete deforestation information.

The section on problems and its description has been totally revised.

Literature review and a thorough problem explanation, by ecosystem, are now included in the revised PIF.

The relation with the GEF-7 Mamirau? project is detailed in section "Coordination and Cooperation with ongoing initiatives and project - GEF Funded projects" of the PIF.

The barriers description has been completely revised.

Policies are now addressed in the revised PIF.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

- a) no
- b) No, it does not as there is little explanation of how threats to ecosystems are being addressed in the areas where pilot restoration will take place, thus sustainability of restoration could be undermined in the medium term, please revise.
- c) please provide a description on the relation of this project to the GEF-7 wetlands project with the same executing partner, GEF ID # 10706.
- d) Yes, cleared.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

- b) Climate risks, based on FAO's climate risk screening, are now embedded in the risk table, and will be further analyzed during PPG.

The relation between the threats and project actions is now detailed in the project description section.

- c) Please refer to our response above. Point addressed.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

There is no discussion of the project logic, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these, please provide after the revisions are undertaken in the rest of the project design.

Please try and enter a Theory of Change diagram in the portal that somebody could read. Now the font etc. is impossible to read and I had to use a magnifying glass.

The Theory of Change, as noted in many of the design comments above, is not very clearly articulated as it sometimes wanders from the focus of the project and is not well linked to the fundamental issue that the project wants to address.

A few specific comments are in order.

First, the GEBs at the top of the table is simply not accurate. The current ambition of 1650 hectares restored will not lead to significant contributions to Brazil NDCs or global environmental/biodiversity benefits. Thus, rewrite that top box to be more accurate and honest and in line with the changes that are made to the area target.

Outcomes 2 and 3 should be combined into a large capacity building effort, a new Component 2, to address the knowledge and technological gaps. Output 2.1.3 makes no sense in the design and is not clearly justified so suggest deletion or a clear rationale for its inclusion. We note that the GEF-7 project is investing in this same type of activity, thus the added value of additional investment in this thematic area does not make any sense, particularly given the problem statement presented to justify this project.

We suggest the creation of a new Component three that is solely focused on initiation of restoration efforts and that identifies more area to be restored either in the existing pilots or through the addition of new pilot sites. GEF restoration investment should be focused in areas where clear global biodiversity benefits can be justified consistent with the articulation identified in the GEF-8 programming directions under objective one of the GEF-8 biodiversity focal area strategy. In addition, more resources should be allocated to this component so that the area target can be significantly increased.

Finally, for each restoration area a baseline description must be provided in the PIF design such that we understand other investments being undertaken in the area that will ensure ecosystem degradation does not continue in the surrounding landscapes where the

restoration is being implemented. This would then allow project to be better aligned with the integrated landscape management approach of objective of the BD strategy.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

The TOC has been revised and a new diagram has been entered in the Portal

The GEBs have been revised and adjusted.

The results framework has been totally revised
Output 2.1.3 has been deleted.

The results framework has been revised, following the GEF PM's suggestions.

A baseline description of the pilot areas is now included in the PIF.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

No, please improve this section which is quite weak and not consistent with other FAO projects in terms of quality and comprehensiveness. Please adjust it based on the project revisions suggested above.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

The full section has been re-written

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

a) yes

b) NA

c) simply listing all the GEF projects in Brazil and their objectives is not adequate. Rather than repeat the objectives of the other GEF projects by cutting and pasting text, please identify specifically what is the potential coordination entry point. Please provide a very detailed description of these cooperation points with ASL and the GEF-7 project on wetlands, GEF# 10706.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Point taken. The coordination with other GEF projects and programs in Brazil has been detailed in the section.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/23/2024

Please revise the indicators based on the suggestions above to increase the area where restoration will be undertaken.

The rationale provided for CI 1 and CI 2 is not reasonable or justified, therefore please delete.

Please adjust CI 6 once these revisions are undertaken.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Core indicators and project indicators have been both revised and included. Core indicators 1 and 2 are deleted. Core indicator 6 has been adjusted

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

- a) no argumentation on this provided.
- b) yes
- c) The project summary and other elements of the PIF reference policy strengthening, but no part of the project investment is directly targeting any policy related activities.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

The PIF has been completely revised.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

No, this is inadequate for all focal areas.

Once the project design is revised, please embellish the descriptions of the alignment with each FA strategy.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

The section on alignment with GEF-8 FAs has been revised

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

No, please identify clearly what specific targets the project will contribute to and how, and be precise and focused in your answer reflecting only the investments the project will make and the outcomes the project will produce.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

GEB targets have been revised, in line with the improved results framework.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

It is noted that the project includes a list of stakeholder consultation undertaken during PIF design phase. However, the list is incomplete and information on the approach to consult stakeholders during project development is not fully clear. Please revise accordingly and provide additional information.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Information on stakeholder consultations conducted at PIF stage is now detailed.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared but please revise with the suggested project revisions above.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

- a. The LoE was signed by an OPF (Andre Luiz Campos de Andrade) who was not the official OPF Ms. Livia Farias Ferreira de Oliveira by the time of PIF submission (April 12th). Ms. Ferrerira de Oliveira tenure?s started six days before. A new LoE is required.
- b. The executing partner in LoE (Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation) is different than in Portal (Mamiraua Sustainable Development Institute) ? this can either amended with the new LoE or by modifying the executing Partner in Portal accordingly.
- c. The total GEF Resources requested in General Project Information (\$5,639,250) is higher than the amount endorsed in the LoE (\$5,625,014) ? the calculations in the letter are wrong. This needs to be fixed in the new LoE

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

- a) The new LOE is attached
- b) The ministry is now in the portal
- c) the amounts have been adjusted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, but the LOE is not valid, see above.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

See issues raised above.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared, but please include the additional maps once project revisions are undertaken.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

Maps are now included

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

ESS risk rating documents are not uploaded to the Portal. Please upload the documents in the Portal.

11/16/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/15/23

ESS form is now uploaded

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project 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. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

4/24/2023

No, many revisions are required. Please take the time to undertake these significant changes and resubmit.

11/22/2023

Please revise per above and resubmit.

11/22/2023

PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/22/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		