

Landscape Restoration and Ecosystem Management for Sustainable Food Systems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10348

Countries

Ghana

Project Name

Landscape Restoration and Ecosystem Management for Sustainable Food Systems

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

12/12/2020

Review completed by PM

3/1/2021

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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
January 14, 2021:

The Table A should only include one FOLUR IP outcome, not multiple outcomes based on Focal Areas (which should appear in Table D). The Agency should edit the Table A Focal Area Outcomes field to read as follows: ?Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.? Please revise accordingly.

February 22, 2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Noted. Table A has been adjusted to reflect only IP FOLU and not all Focal areas.

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

January 14, 2021:

1. The Project Objective doesn't appear aligned with the FOLUR Program as it doesn't mention food systems nor sustainability. Please amend accordingly.
2. The expected outcomes and outputs don't reflect the subcomponents as presented in the PAD nor the number of outcomes in the budget. Please complete the Table B accordingly including clearly identified outcomes and relevant indicators and targets in the outcomes column, so that we can better understand the expected results of the proposed outputs/activities.
3. No need to mention in Table B which component of this project contributes to which component of the PFD. Please remove this reference and ensure the identified outcomes in table B are clear enough to demonstrate the alignment with the PFD.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. It may again be emphasized that the integrated landscape management includes productive, and protective functions of the landscapes, and food systems cut across both of these key functions. PDO is reflective of this concept and has been formulated keeping in view the blended finance nature of the project, the earlier agreed bilateral discussions with GEFSEC and the M&E guidance on the need for the PDO to reflect component outputs.

Food systems is central to the GEF financing and has been better emphasized in the document throughout in the component structures. The support for food ecosystems is mainstreamed at two levels ? input support for sustainable cocoa production which is the key livelihood and income source for small holders, which is turn is relevant to the farmers being food secure (ii) direct support for additional food crop production to the cocoa farmers for better agronomic practices and post-harvest storage and processing.

This will be a demand driven support through community sub-projects as described in project description section 3.1 and 3.2 of PAD.

2. As discussed bilaterally the alignment of project components, outputs/outcomes and indicators was clarified (via email). Table B has been updated accordingly to refine the presentation to confirm that the project remains aligned with the FOLUR objectives and outcomes. In general it is important to remember that Program level outcomes /indicators were defined keeping in mind the diversity of all child projects, and provided as a menu of options for child projects to tailor their needs.

3. As per the usual practice and presentation of child projects this has been a recommendation so far. This also part clarifies Pt 2 above on ensuring the alignment with the FOLUR component structure.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

January 21, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.

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

January 14, 2021:

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.
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
January 14, 2021:

1. Thank you for the Annex C in the Portal. Please provide more details of the activities carried out under the "Project Preparation and Local Consultancy Services" item.
2. The total PPG amount should be \$300,000 (fees are missing). Please correct.
3. Please note that the "PPG Required" box under Part I/section F should be checked.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response
Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. Please note that the PPG activities are ongoing and a short completion report will be prepared when completed as per the process. The standard template for PPG status has been used to provide the details. However to clarify these costs relate to several activities including (i) Gender assessment and action plan; (ii) SLM technology assessment (Costs/Benefit Analysis of different technologies and packages in the selected ecological zones of Ghana); (iii) Water quality analysis; (iv) External Auditing of Accounts; (v) Technical support consultant; and (vi) PIM preparation.
2. It is kindly clarified that the PPG information including the fee is available in Table F of the portal CER/DS as per template. The total is indeed 300k. Annex C only details the PPG grant activity costs available to the GoG, as the fee is not inclusive in the RETF.
3. The required box is Checked (Table F of GEF CER) and is auto populated by the GEF portal. If the issue continues please consult with the GEF portal team.

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

January 14, 2021:

1. In the description below the core indicators, what is included in the 81,468 ha of SM is unclear (we only know it will include enrichment planting, trees on farms, boundary planting, etc). Please explain how this estimate was calculated and specify the different kind of SFM.

2. The description under the Core Indicator section provide a GHG mitigation result for the total financing amount of the overall project (135 million t CO₂e) which is different from the EX-ACT tool (232 million tCO₂e). Please clarify the calculation, including the one corresponding to the results attributed to the GEF grant (how do we get 32 million tCO₂e?), and ensure the information provided is consistent throughout all the information provided in the Portal.

March 10, 2021:

The estimated targets for GEF Core Indicators have been calculated based on the GEF attribution (as part of the total financing). GEF guidance says that the targets should be estimated based on the full project financing (i.e. inclusive of the co-financing). This means that project result framework, as presented in Annex A, should be aligned with GEF core indicators, including the hectares in FRs and wildlife PAs. Please amend accordingly.

April 27, 2021:

Thank you for the revision. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021:

Thank you for the project review and overall clearance of the earlier revisions. Noted the comment on core indicators. As recommended the issue of the percentage attribution which was included in error in the GEF CER, has been revised. This was earlier done as the project is being implemented in two landscapes (northern and cocoa landscapes in south west-central region) with synergistic activities within the various components and

was initially used during discussions with the counterparts to avoid double counting the areas. The revised calculations for the GHG emissions over a 20 year period are based on the target areas in which activities will be implemented under the FOLUR project and the results captured are those resulting from the GEF project including the co-financing in the Cocoa Landscapes. Revised EXACT tool has been provided. The Portal CER, Core Indicator worksheet and the PAD (incremental reasoning Annex 4) have been revised to reflect the results.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. The core indicator details have been clarified. Please refer to the GEF equivalency table (Annex A of the portal CER and Annex 4 of the PAD). The 81,468 ha will be targeted for sustainable forest management (both forest reserves and off-forest reserve areas). This will include enrichment planting, trees on farms, boundary planting, etc. in the forest reserves (49,125 ha) and promoting alternative livelihoods and sustainable land and water management practices in buffer areas outside forest reserves (32,345 ha).

2. Point is noted but also clarified that the overall EXACT is calculated over 30 yrs for the entire integrated project (while GEF requires estimations over 20 yrs). As explained the GEF attribution is extrapolated from the overall calculations for GEF reporting purposes and perhaps that is the difference the comment refers to.

In the meanwhile, the GHG calculations using EX-ACT were redone by the GoG to make minor modifications to the assumptions and land use areas. Revised EXACT has been submitted and numbers have been made consistent in the documents.

Overall, as per the Ex-ACT, annual emissions reductions for the overall package of Landscape Restoration activities are **5,565,999 tCO₂**. The GEF portion of financing is equal to 24 percent of the overall financing for the Landscape Restoration activities; thus, annual emissions reductions attributable to the GEF are estimated at **1,335,839.67 tCO₂**. Thus the total emissions reductions attributable to the GEF over a **standard GEF period of 20 years, thus, stand at 26,716,793 tCO₂ equivalent**. Project activities will mainly provide emission reductions resulting from the avoidance of deforestation through improved management of FRs, and biological corridors in CREMAs,[1 including natural forests on community-managed land, restoration of degraded forests through regeneration and afforestation, riparian vegetation restoration, replacement of monocrop practices with intercropping and agroforestry, and wildfire prevention and management.

[1]For the GHG estimates, it is assumed that, with project, these forested areas will remain in the same condition; without the project, they will experience deforestation and degradation. For the baseline assumption, the team estimates, based on existing

literature, that approximately 78 percent of the FRs and PAs are forested and about 40 percent of the CREMAs are forested.

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

January 20, 2021:

The description of the environmental problems (including root causes and barriers) is limited and remains vague and general at country level. Please elaborate further on the kind and the importance of the environmental problems, root causes and barriers (including about the biodiversity) specifically in the targeted areas of the GEF investments. This is important to show the relevance of the proposed activities and the targeted project areas in the FOLUR approach.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Point noted. GEF annex 4 of the PAD (also attached as addendum to the PID) has been revised to add additional information to strengthen the context and rationale. Please do however note that the agile process of the WB limits the length of the PAD (both main text and annexes), and therefore a careful balance has been drawn to ensure that the project meets both the GEF and WB process needs. Thank you for your consideration.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 20, 2021:

1. The information on the baseline scenario and existing initiatives is scattered in the PAD (part is in annex 4) and what this baseline is concretely providing in the targeted

cocoa landscapes is not always clear or very general (for example "performance based payment for emissions reductions"). Please complete in a same part of the document (it can be in annex 4 if the number of pages is limited in the main part of the PAD) all the existing relevant baseline scenario and initiatives (including the ones from the institutions, the private sector, and the international cooperation), and present what they are concretely doing in the targeted cocoa landscapes (for example, what are the signatories of the CFI already doing?).

2. In Annex 4, the baseline investments in the Cocoa forest landscapes include the following items: (i)..., (ii)..., and (iv). Isn't there one missing?

3. Please also consider in the baseline the relevance of other ongoing projects/programs in the same landscape on cocoa production and supply chain (in addition to the presented WB projects), such as the GEF-6 IAP Food Security program.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. Point is noted. As recommended the section in the Incremental annex has been revised and elements further strengthened to support the reasoning.

2. Noted and the editorial error was corrected.

3. It should be clarified that the GEF-7 investment (under FOLUR) is focused on the cocoa forest landscapes and not districts in Northern Ghana. Therefore, for a realistic narrative of baseline the FS IAP GEF-6 (WB-GEF SLWMP project) interventions were not considered as direct baseline. The context has been referenced in the PAD (incremental reasoning GEF annex) as the SLWMP has been critical in identifying both the gaps and the needs which have helped define key project activities.

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

January 22, 2021:

1. In component 1, the policy support activities, incentives and guidelines seem to be focused on restoration and sustainable production. Please clarify how the sustainability will be promoted along the value chain and particularly what will be done concretely on policy and regulation to promote the deforestation-free and sustainable cocoa production (incentives, standards, certification...).

2. Considering the blended nature of the investments (GEF and PROGREEN) which allows the consideration of a wider scale and more crops, please indicate the share of national cocoa production and landscape area this project will impact.

3. The description mentions in Component 3 that GEF investments will "focus" on community management of the wildlife corridors. Considering a FOLUR project is not expected to support PA management, please clarify the envisioned activities, their cost and how they contribute to the enhancement of the sustainability of the cocoa value chain.

4. The sub-component 3.1 is key to achieve the FOLUR objectives as it is the one which plans the investments on the ground to improve the sustainability of the cocoa production. Nevertheless, we learn that the activities planned under this sub-component will fall under the following categories: (a) silvopastoral activities will support farmer-managed natural regeneration and establishment of woodlots; (b) establishment and management of rangelands; (c) restoration of riparian vegetation; and (d) water management investments, such as weirs and dugouts. Please clarify how concretely the cocoa production will be considered by this sub-component (in addition to the replanting of up to 1,000 ha of moribund cocoa farms).

5. In component 3, we learn the project will support the establishment of Village Savings and Loans Associations. Nevertheless, this kind of structure is not presented in the baseline and we don't know how it relates with the project objectives. Please explain.

6. The sub-component 3.2 will promote value addition, market access, and income diversification. In this sub-component, there is no consideration for improving sustainability in the value chain. Please clarify how the project will meet the sustainability objectives of the FOLUR program through these activities.

7. The CRC Committees are mentioned for the first time in Annex 2 (components description) and only in this annex. As they are targeted by the project, please clarify in the baseline what CRC stands for and is the role of the CRC Committees.

8. The total cost of Component 4 for the GEF will be \$780k while the only M&E plan will use \$855k from GEF resources according to the PAD. Please explain and ensure the financial numbers are consistent.

9. In the PAD, the GEF contribution to component 3 and 4 are said to be \$8.84 million and \$1.11 million while in the Portal it is respectively \$9,146,881 and \$780,000. Please clarify and ensure the financial numbers are consistent.

10. Food value chain and deforestation-free sourcing boxes are not checked in the Project Taxonomy Worksheet. Please check these boxes to be consistent with the project objectives.

11. We note the purchase of 5 vehicles. Nevertheless, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. In GEF policy (GEF/C.59/Inf.03), such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program (for each vehicle). The Secretariat assesses such requests and decides whether to approve them, based on following criteria: type of project, operating environment, contribution to achievement of project results, and share of costs covered by co-financing, among others. Also, please note that the cost of the 3 pick-ups is not reported in the column "Total (USDeq.)" of the budget and amend accordingly.

12. The proposed activities doesn't clearly consider the demand side which has an important influence on the value chain. Considering it is a key driver to improve the sustainability of the production, please consider completing the activities accordingly.

13. The collaboration with Cote d'Ivoire is critical. Nevertheless, there is no mention in the description on how the project will work and coordinate with the neighboring country and contribute thus to enhance the sustainability of this food system at global scale. Please elaborate further on this element.

14. The FOLUR Global Platform led by the WB is a key element of the Program the child projects are expected to engage with. Nevertheless, no activities with this Platform are considered in the project description. We only learn in the PAD in "Annex 4: GEF Technical Annex ? Incremental Reasoning", under the Knowledge Management section, that this project will share lessons with the Global Platform (without further details). Please elaborate further on the potential engagement opportunities related to all the Platform 4 Pillars and upload the template elaborated by the WB to guide and clarify the activities at country level.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the all the complements and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. Point noted. In the context of Ghana as proposed policy support needs to be viewed from the lens of enabling and strengthening various policy elements (e.g. guidelines for regulation and management of admitted settlements, review of conservation status of forest trees in Ghana etc) for larger uptake. Noting that FOLUR defines a menu of option that participating countries could choose from and tailor to the specific projects needs and Government priorities. As described in the component details, while the overall component aims to strengthen the planning and policy framework through carrying out spatial planning and implementation, policy support, and capacity building - support is included for ILM planning that accounts for multisectoral uses, plans for adaptation measures to address climate risks and fostering partnerships to support the adoption of at scale sustainable approaches including in the cocoa landscapes. Specific support through the development of spatial planning tools for mapping/monitoring impacts including for sustainable cocoa production (to ensure compliance with the climate-smart cocoa standards) which are currently limited, will be both innovative and added value for the cocoa sector. Further these tools/mechanisms (e.g. Forest, Cocoa Monitoring Systems, tree registration/counting/carbon accounting system, database collation, maps etc) are expected to help decision-makers understand the landscape level impacts to make more effective decisions. This approach will help ensure both enforcement and management of risks of competitive/illegal land uses that threaten food security and habitat fragmentation and overall ensure that the footprint of forest loss and degradation due to cocoa development is being reduced and adequately monitored.

2. It should be clarified again that the financing from PROGREEN and GEF have different focus both in terms of support and target areas. GEF financing is largely in the cocoa-forest landscapes in Pra river basin (as approved under FOLUR) whilst the PROGREEN is investing in the Savannah landscapes in the north in the Western Wildlife Corridor where there is no cocoa cultivation. Hence target areas are geographically very distinct and all the work on Cocoa is supported through GEF and part IDA financing only. As indicated in the core indicators table GEF support within the Cocoa landscapes will cover 81,468 ha under CI.3 and 70,870 ha under CI.4

As a general note it is also important to clarify that the scope of this project as designed and approved focuses on reducing the deforestation footprint, and income diversification for project supported communities/ farmers. The impact is not directly being measured within the context of the national cocoa production within the sector (which currently stands at the 2 billion plus annual turnover). The Ghana Cocoa Rejuvenation study (under finalization by AG GP of WB) shows famers cannot adopt agronomic technologies without investment support needed to manage without incomes during the 3 to 4 years that cocoa takes to mature. Further most for majority of small holder farmers borrowing is not a viable option for replanting cocoa farms, as repayments exceed net returns whilst the cocoa matures. Compensation and input support that the

project will provide for replanting to farmers addresses this significant gap. The project economic and financial analysis included in the PAD includes additional details on the economic benefits and, the GEF annex elaborates on the project area in terms of both significance and barriers.

For information please note that in the context of Ghana currently there are seven cocoa growing regions: namely Ashanti, Brong Ahafo, Eastern, Volta, Central and Western North and Western South regions. Based on data from COCOBOD about half of the current production comes from Eastern, Ashanti, and Central Regions (estimated 44% , reference <https://cocobod.gh/cocoa-purchases>).

3. Please note that the interventions identified are not directly in the PAs per se, but in the buffer areas within the cocoa landscapes which will support community managed areas. At the bilateral discussion in August 2020, this point was extensively discussed as the scope of work is well within the BD focal area, albeit ensuring that GEF support under FOLUR is not invested into PAs or Wildlife corridor management. The focus is on improved landscapes to benefit biodiversity. The direct support under component 3.4 has no GEF investments (please refer to the detailed component descriptions, Annex 2 of the PAD). The overall component includes activities financed by IDA to support PA work in the project.

Specifically under section 3.2 the GEF investments will support engagement with admitted settlements and farm owners [to limit their farm expansion, based on the developed FMPs and reserve settlements commissioner's report] . This activity will be undertaken in FRs in the Cocoa Forest Landscape, as FRs in the Savannah zone have no admitted farms/settlements. In addition, the GEF investments will support, as required, the establishment and reconstitution of the Community Forest Committees and provision of livelihoods support (for example, woodlots, beekeeping, and poultry rearing etc) to these buffer communities to reduce pressures on PAs, enhance protection of the forest resource, and diversify income opportunities for the farmers.

4. To clarify, the component description has been revised (Component 3.1. Annex 2, PAD). However it is important to emphasize that the project components and subcomponents are funded through multiple sources (FOLUR, PROGREEN and IDA) given the integrated nature of its design (real cofinancing) and, therefore the narrative covers all the activities supported, including in target areas that are not the GEF focus. We confirm that the **GEF investments are only in the cocoa farms and surrounding areas in the Pra river basin.**

GEF interventions support improvements in cocoa production through a multi-pronged approach in the target landscape through COCOBOD. These investments will support introduction of improved (heat-, drought-tolerant, and disease-resistant) planting materials; replacement of old trees and improving soil fertility (through replanting of up to 1,000 ha of moribund cocoa farms affected by the swollen shoot disease); integrated pest management and cocoa spraying, in addition to diversification of crops through

support to sub-projects as described above. This comprehensive support aims to enhance productivity of the cocoa farms and increase economic benefits for the farmers. Additionally, COCOBOD will also specifically target improved cocoa management systems and support engagements with cocoa community-based organizations, lead cocoa facilitators, and cocoa farmers.

5. It is important to emphasize that the design of the project builds upon successful experiences of ongoing investments, including the GEF (SLWMP) and WB's broader landscape portfolio in Ghana. VSLA is not a new approach for Ghana, but is tried, tested and successful as part of the GEF SLWMP, particularly when viewed from the gender equality lens (it has been particularly been empowering for women as they take ownership of their finances). In fact, this proposed operation is scaling up the approach. The relevance is introduced in the PAD within the context of gender in the main text and has also now been included in the lessons learned to provide a clear context. This also aligns with the GEF gender policy and the gender strategy of the FOLUR IP. Component 3.2 captures the VSLA activities to respond to the need for gender sensitive actions within projects.

6. It is important to note that overall sustainability of cocoa supply chains in Ghana revolves around the management of landscape and promoting practices and incentives that avoid the extension of cocoa areas into forests. Further, increased sustainable production and enhanced quality of cocoa beans is a focus of support to cocoa farmers as majority of cocoa beans are meant for export. Sustainability in the context of project support is on two levels: (i) adopting better standards of cocoa production (better varieties, management and harvesting practices), which reduce the cocoa expansion, and thereby make it possible for farmers to produce cocoa from their existing land parcel, and without incurring additional labor costs related to opening up new areas, and investments (ii) ensuring quality of cocoa post-harvest. This is aligned with the premise of the concept approved under FOLUR.

Sustainability under 3.2 is built around support provided through provision of small post-harvest structures, improved market access, and promotion of value addition of selected cash crop commodities (cocoa [in the Transition zone] and cashew and shea [in the savannah zone]) which have been identified as priority commodities for the project. Providing farmers with the necessary quality and leverage to compete in markets and further improve their livelihoods contributes to long term sustainability (and was one of the key criteria in the selection of the project under FOLUR). Significantly the project will also support the conversion of associations into formal cooperatives to improve their access to larger markets, where possible, mostly for cocoa and cashew. In this context, the activities will be conducted through COCOBOD and its association with the CFI, both of which will ensure continuity after project completion.

7. This was an error in editing ? the committees in question are Community Forest Committees and a clarification on their role and composition has been added in the PAD.

8. The overall project has a strong focus on M&E both at the project monitoring and component levels. While the total M&E cost for the blended project is larger, GEF related M&E activities/costs are budgeted at 855K and embedded across components including Cps 1, 3 and 4. The cost of Component 4 is indeed 780,000. The GEF budget matrix includes the M&E breakdown by the prescribed category.

9. Please note

- for Component 4- Table B in GEF datasheet as per template requirement separates Component 4 (\$0.78K) costs from the PMC (\$0.32K, reflected in PMC row) which together amount to \$1.11 million. The PAD reflects this total amount.

- for Component 3, the typing error is corrected in the component description. There is otherwise no noted discrepancy between the GEF datasheet Table B (\$9.14 million) and the PAD cost table (\$9.14 million per se).

10. Noted and Taxonomy worksheet has been revised.

11. Given the scale and expanse of the project and following extensive consultations with the government counterparts the need for vehicles has been justified for the following reasons and the Ghana team requests kind approval of the GEF in view of the existing circumstances. In total, the project will purchase 13 pick-up trucks and 10 vehicles. Of these, **the GEF financing will cover only 3 pick up trucks and 2 all - terrain vehicles**. The remaining vehicles and trucks will be purchased with the IDA and PROGREEN co-financing to meet the overall needs. The budget and PAD has been adjusted to reflect the same.

While building on the good basis established under the previous Bank / GEF funding, the project will expand its activities significantly into a new landscape (the Cocoa Forest Landscape) where the implementing agencies do have presence but no logistics provisions that would allow expansion of activities at the envisaged scale. More importantly these new PRA Basin districts and related regional offices require support for the operating environments both for monitoring and supervision purposes. The nature of restoration and community driven projects requires close presence to communities most of which are remote with access through tough terrains; the rural and forested terrain requires 4x4 vehicles (and not simply motorcycles) to be able to reach communities and remote areas within forest reserves. The GoG is unable to provide co-financing for purchase of the new vehicles at this time due to an extreme fiscal deficit.

12. Point is noted. However, given the scope of the project defined at the concept stage and keeping a reality check on available resources the activities have been defined to focus upon sustainable cocoa production and improved quality within the value chain. We also acknowledge that global demand for cocoa is the ultimate driver but the

influence on corporates is through national regulatory agencies. To that end the CFI can have an important role and regional collaboration can have more influence on the demand side. This aspect is something that that project will benefit from once the FOLUR Global coordination grant is rolled out, and thus this should be looked through a broader lens.

13. Given that both Ghana and CI are signatories to the CFI, it is expected that during implementation there will be opportunities to coordinate activities both at the national level (thru CFI) and at the global level through the FOLUR coordination grant activities which has a strong pillar on KM and communications (and a guidance note on potential docking opportunities). The intent of the project is to push for transboundary collaboration. Potential areas for KM exchange being considered include the following (the KM section the PAD Annex 4 has been updated to provide additional context and details) :-

- Engagement with regional cocoa platforms, CFI, and related international value chains, including exploring opportunities with IFC through the FOLUR coordination platform activities
- Cocoa traceability (with regulatory agencies and common private sector companies working both Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana)
- Models for cocoa rehabilitation support, leveraging on the ongoing work by the FCPF on lessons from other countries such as Colombia and Peru that can demonstrate who works and how the governments are supporting such efforts.
- Notable also is that learnings from the cocoa sector can be adapted to shea and cashew value chains for Ghana, particularly in the context of collaborating with PROGREEN activities to leverage larger impacts.

14. Please note that the project has provided a clear roadmap and budget to support GEF specific KM activities based on the FOLUR guidance (engage in dialogues and relevant cocoa related roundtables, build the related capacities for both national, and regional transboundary cooperation, develop/disseminate trainings and guidelines; promotion material for knowledge sharing on landscape restoration and sustainable cocoa production practices, and related standards for certification opportunities etc.). Given that neither the Global Platform coordination grant activities nor other CPs with a cocoa focus are rolled out yet, provisions have been put in place to plan concrete annual actions through consultation with the key stakeholders during project implementation. Nevertheless the section has been further finetuned to better highlight the exchange/cooperation opportunities (as also highlighted in the above response and aligned with the FOLUR guidance note) It should also be clarified that the FOLUR guidance is a note providing directions for potential opportunities and, not a

mandatory/prescribed template per se. The KM section the PAD Annex 4 and GEF budget matrix has been updated to provide additional context and details.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

Yes, considering that the component 2 and the PA-related activities, which are not aligned, are not funded by the GEF. Cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted. Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 20, 2021:

Thank you for the separate Annex 4 of the PAD on GEF incremental reasoning which provides useful information and states number of projects and parallel financing with the GEF FOLUR project. Nevertheless, the information on the baseline is scattered in the PAD and the gaps that need to be filled, considering what is already in place, are not clearly presented (this is important to understand the incremental reasoning of the GEF funding). Please elaborate further in this annex on the existing gaps in the baseline scenario and initiatives (including those from the institutions and private sector that are described in the main part of the document) and how the GEF contribution will articulate with and build on this baseline to fill the gaps to achieve the sustainable transformation of the cocoa food system.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Please see response to similar question above and paras. 24-29 in GEF technical Annex (Annex 4 of PAD and also attached as addendum to the PID) are now updated. The incremental reasoning has been further strengthened. In summary the added value of GEF financing centers around promoting sustainable cocoa and agriculture practices through restoration and sustainable management of forest reserves, increasing trees and enhancing carbon stocks in the farming systems. In addition, coupled with the increasing global demand for sustainability in the supply of cocoa beans, there is a clear positive incentive and common interest among cocoa producers, regulators, buyers, and chocolate makers to move to more sustainable and climate-friendly production practices. The GEF support will contribute toward removing key barriers associated with increased investments in sustainable production practices and support systems, governance processes to enhance participation in comprehensive land-use and restoration planning, and environmentally sustainable food and commodity value chains focused on the cocoa production. See also earlier response on sustainability. Other ongoing initiatives are focusing on cocoa production regions in High Forest Zone. The focus of GEF in PRA and transitional zone in of itself has added value compared to baseline. The rehabilitation of cocoa combined with holistic farm level planning that views returns from cocoa and food security comprehensively is a newer element of the project.

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

January 14, 2021:

1. The area of forest land restored is significant, which is very good. Please explain what kind of forest and restoration works are considered and, for each kind, to which extent (hectares).
2. The Biodiversity Focal Area funding window significantly contributes to this project. Nevertheless, despite relevant activities (such as forest restoration, corridors improved management...), there is no biodiversity benefits captured. Please consider adding a biodiversity core indicator (it could be 4.1 from the forest restoration works - there would not be double counting as the core indicators 3 and 4 are different).

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. Noted and have been clarified. Details are available in the Results Framework and, specifically for GEF investments, in the equivalency table for GEF Core Indicators in Annex A of GEF CER and Annex 4 of the PAD. As per a later query the project will not be using exotic species. This is also part of the E&S requirements for the project.
2. The biodiversity benefits have been better highlighted in the incremental reasoning and global benefits sections. The team also accepts the recommendation to add a biodiversity benefit sub indicator (4.1). Please see indicator equivalency table in Annex A of GEF CER and Annex 4 of the PAD.

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

January 20, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.
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

January 14, 2021:

The map is provided but geo-coordinates are missing. Please complete.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the complementary information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: The coordinates of the GEF target districts and Forest Reserves have been added to the GEF CER/Data Sheet and Annex 4 of the PAD.

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

January 20, 2021:

No. Please consider the comment above on the missing consideration of the necessary activities linked to the FOLUR Global Platform. The description should explain how the child project will contribute to the overall programmatic approach, from landscape or national level project activities to the global program. One major additionality of FOLUR global coordination is to engage regional and global level stakeholders in the different stage of the value chain to promote deforestation-free food production, consumption and finance. Please clarify how Ghana child project will contribute to the global project and how it will benefit from other child projects and global project. The collaboration with Cote d'Ivoire in particular is critical.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Please see also responses earlier on alignment with the FOLUR Global Platform. Based on GEF recommendation and the FOLUR guidance note, elements have been incorporated in the KM section as below (in PAD, Annex 4) aligned with the FOLUR Platform Pillars as relevant for the Ghana project.

- *Global Engagement:* through participation in Global meetings of FOLUR partners and CPs and other key meetings and roundtables. Models for cocoa rehabilitation support, leveraging on the ongoing work by the FCPF on lessons from other countries such as Colombia and Peru that can demonstrate who works and how the governments are supporting such efforts.

- *Regional Engagement* in commodity platforms and training events: through participation in regional cocoa platform discussions with private and public sector representatives including with CFI/WCF; contribution to regional training and dialogue workshops on sustainable cocoa practices, exploring opportunities with IFC through the FOLUR coordination platform activities Trans-boundary dialogues on the cocoa sector

through CFI can be strengthened with neighboring countries, especially Cote-d'Ivoire, in the context cocoa traceability (with regulatory agencies and common private sector companies working both Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana). FOLUR's coordination and dialogue mechanisms will help exchange with partner projects to generate lessons for uptake and replication.

- *Trainings, Knowledge and communication*: through developing/disseminating training guidelines and promotion material on landscape restoration and sustainable cocoa production practices. This will include utilizing the opportunities through the FOLUR global platform and its core partners supporting the knowledge and communications. On in-country training, knowledge sharing, and dialogue workshops (sustainable cocoa practices; their contribution to sustainable landscapes; and related standards for certification opportunities etc), the project where relevant will work in close coordination with national academic and technical institutions and other relevant organizations/platforms. Notable also is that learnings from the cocoa sector can be adapted to shea and cashew value chains for Ghana, particularly in the context of collaborating with PROGREEN activities to leverage larger impacts. Overall, the project will enhance effective communication (videos and guidelines) to share project results and experiences (outcome stories, blogs) that can assist in leveraging future financing and also ensure that knowledge from the project is transferred into the Government's action plans and framework for wider scale-up nationwide.

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

January 14, 2021:

Yes, cleared. (Please note that some images are not visible in the left column of the table provided in the Portal: can they be made visible or simply removed?)

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for providing a new table.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. The table in the stakeholder section has been replaced with one without images. Thank you.

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

January 14, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.
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

January 14, 2021:

We take note that the private sector engagement in Ghana is considered "atypical". Nevertheless, beyond the landscape and farmers level and their link with COCOBOD, the description of the value chain is unclear and no company is mentioned. Who are the signatories of CFI? Aren't they intervening stakeholders such as financiers, processors and international traders that can influence the sustainability of the value chain? Please elaborate further on all the involved private stakeholders of the value chain and how concretely they will be engaged in the project to enhance the sustainability of the production. Please refer to the GEF Private Sector Engagement Strategy and notably its entry points in Table 1 (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.59_Inf.18_Private%20Sector%20Engagement%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf).

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: At the outset it should be mentioned that as per Bank's operational guidance projects do not identify and pre-select specific brands and private sector companies/industries by name within project appraisal documents. There is a diligent and transparent process for selection and bidding and that will be followed in due course should there be specific interest from companies to invest during implementation.

As was explained earlier in Ghana the Cocoa sector (its value chain) is highly regulated by COCOBOD, but has started to open the space for the private sector to directly purchase cocoa beans from farmers, import agricultural input (fertilizer and agrochemicals) and provide a number of services. As rightly mentioned, the Cocoa Forest Initiative (CFI) which is a government partnership with more than 34 leading cocoa and chocolate companies was set up to end deforestation and forest degradation driven by cocoa production in Ghana. More harmonization is however currently needed in production and traceability of sustainable cocoa supply chains, as several different standards are in use. The World Cocoa Foundation (WCF) is the secretariat for the CFI. Project design interventions are expected to support mobilization of the private sector, essentially cocoa and chocolate companies (members of the WCF) who are by and large also signatories of the CFI, and some of them are already engaging in the pilot Emissions Reductions program in the high forest zone. In addition as the upcoming World Bank's Cocoa Value Chain Development Project led by the Agriculture Global Practice is developed, there will be additional opportunities for leveraging private sector engagement.

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

January 14, 2021:

We take note of the environmental and social risks analysis and supporting documents. Thank you. To complete the analysis, please address the following comments:

1. The project needs to include a more detailed climate risk analysis including potential impacts on Cocoa sector based on robust scientific data and mitigation measures. As written now, the climate risk laid out is more general and points mostly to mitigating emissions from the Cocoa sector as opposed to the threat the climate change poses to crops and ecosystems. For further guidance, please refer to STAP guidance

<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>.

2. The COVID-19 analysis is essentially focused on contamination risks during project implementation. In the landscapes targeted by the GEF investments, more analysis is needed on 1/other potential impacts (such as availability of technical expertise and capacity and changes in timelines, enabling environment including government focus, and financing including co-financing, procurement prices...) and 2/the opportunities the project will provide in the context of the pandemic to help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future, while increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems. Please elaborate further on these aspects under the "COVID19 Risk and Response" in the project description of the Portal.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021:

1. The team added information (in Annex 4) on climate risk analysis to the cocoa sector based on the national data and documents / plans. The climate risk analysis in the main part was kept as it was as it meets the Bank requirements and is concise (the Bank has a standard regarding length of the main section of the PAD which the current project PAD already exceeds).

2. Noted. Context for COVID-19 response and project interventions for supporting recovery efforts has been better clarified in the portal CER risks section and in PAD (paras 4-6, 28, 30, 55). In addition, as per the WB corporate requirement in addition to risk section, a COVID annex (Annex 6) has been added to the PAD to provide the overall context for Ghana program adjustment to COVID-19 (in line with the World Bank Group COVID-19 Crisis Response Approach,[1]¹ in particular Pillar 2 (Protecting Poor and Vulnerable People) and Pillar 4 (Strengthening Policies, Institutions and Investments for Rebuilding Better) as it contributes to enhancing livelihoods of poor rural communities, resilient recovery, and rebuilding better. This is also submitted as an attachment to the GEF CER /Data sheet).

[1] World Bank. 2020. ?Saving Lives, Scaling-up Impact and Getting Back on Track: World Bank Group COVID-19 Crisis Response Approach Paper.?

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
January 22, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.
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
January 20, 2021:

We learn in the PAD that the project will contribute to Ghana's set national voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target. Nevertheless and in addition to the LDN reference, the consistency of the project with identified national processes under the relevant conventions is not presented. Please elaborate further on this aspect (NDC, REDD+, reports to the Rio Conventions...).

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response
Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Given the limitations in length of the PAD the team has tried to balance the scope of content to be included. Given its relevance for GEF reference information has been included (LDN reference in the GEF data sheet under core indicator table and in paras 36 and 37 in the section 'Relevance to Higher Level Objectives')

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

January 14, 2021:

The knowledge management approach is included in various components of the project and it is notably an important element of component 4. Nevertheless, the proposed approach is unclear in terms of timelines and deliverables. Please complete by presenting a clear knowledge management approach with clearly identified timelines and deliverables.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Please also see responses on KM above which provide details of the changes that will be incorporated in the PAD (Annex 4). In addition, for GEF's reference the KM activities and budgets have been included separately also in the GEF budget matrix as an additional sheet.

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

January 14, 2021:

Partially. The Monitoring & Evaluation Plan provided in the Project Result Framework is not budgeted and the budget provided only shows limited items. Please provide a complete budgeted M&E Plan including indicators and targets.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: The comment is unclear as the Results Framework is the monitoring framework for the project level activities with clear indicators and targets. As in other WB projects submitted and approved, the M&E activities are budgeted and reflected by line items prescribed in the GEF Budget template (therefore the comment on limited items is unclear). The M&E arrangements are also described in the PAD, which perhaps was missed by the reviewer (refer to M&E arrangements in Annex 1 of PAD and the GEF technical annex of the PAD). For GEF's clarity the M&E activities are included separately in the GEF budget matrix.

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

January 14, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance. Thank you.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

Yes, considering the comment above in the Map box is addressed. In Annex A, there are two ToC diagrams. Please remove one.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for removing the duplicated ToC. Cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted. The duplication was a portal error at the earlier submission. It has been fixed. Thank you

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

The indicators in the results framework do not include all GEF sub-core indicators that are stated in the project document or they are different. Please complete with the GEF core indicators as presented in the project description.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: The comment is unclear as it is not evident which project document is being referenced here? The PAD includes the RF and GEF DS reports on relevant GEF Core Indicators.

Kindly note that while the language may not be exactly be the same between the RF and the GEF CI, they are included within and capture the indicator targets either individually or through a combination of targets. To avoid confusion going forward, for better clarity a GEF equivalency table has been included to show the alignment and attribution (see Annex A of the portal CER/Data sheet)

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 22, 2021:

Most of GEF Secretariat comments made at earlier stages have been addressed and a detailed and clear response matrix is uploaded. Thank you, this is much appreciated. Some clarifications are still needed as presented in this review sheet. Cleared.

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** Noted Clearance of the earlier comments (pre decision meeting). Thank you.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

The Council made comments at PFD level applying to all the child projects. Where relevant, they need to be addressed. Please add in the Portal under the Annex section the response Matrix related to the Council comments.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional consideration. Cleared

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: As was discussed and confirmed there are no pending Council comments specific to Ghana. However, a response matrix for the general recommendations of the Council members as they relate to this Ghana project has been prepared and submitted. See attached matrix in the portal CER.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

The STAP made comments at PFD level applying to all the child projects. Where relevant, they need to be addressed. Please add in the Portal under the Annex section the response Matrix related to the STAP comments.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for the additional consideration. Cleared

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: As was discussed and confirmed there are no pending STAP comments specific to Ghana. However, a response matrix for the general recommendations of the STAP as they relate to this Ghana project has been prepared and submitted. See attached matrix in portal CER.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
January 14, 2021:

Please address the comment raised above on the Project Map and Coordinates.

February 22, 2021:

Thank you for adding the geo-referenced information. Cleared

Agency Response **WB Response Feb 19, 2021:** The coordinates of the GEF target districts and Forest Reserves have been added to the GEF CER/Data Sheet and Annex 4 of the PAD.

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

N/A

Agency Response

Response April 27, 2021: Response to comment below is included here as there is no response box available. Comment from March 10th has been addressed and reflected in the revised documents. Following appraisal of the project, the overall IDA envelope was increased from 50 M to 75M. The documents have been revised accordingly to reflect this increased allocations for the IDA supported activities and small adjustments were made to the results framework targets, including addressing the GEF comment. No changes made to the design and structure of the project components. Revised package has been submitted.

WB Response Feb 19, 2021: Responses to below comments are included here as there is no response box available.

1. Please kindly note that the GEF Portal CER is the official GEF data sheet that is submitted for projects. The PDF version can be downloaded from the portal. Word files are not submitted but only a reference for GEF IAs
2. Given the integrated nature of the project the Pre-decision meeting comments and response matrix (addressing earlier GEF comments were provided). Decision meeting minutes will be provided upon completion of the meeting (scheduled for March 2nd, 2021 and discussed bilaterally with GEF project reviewer).
2. Both track change and clean PAD versions with key changes are submitted in the portal. However as per disclosure policy these documents are for GEF review only (public circulation is restricted till Board approval).

3. Formatting error has been corrected in the PAD. Thank you for pointing it out.

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 N/A

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 14, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised.

In addition:

1. Please upload on the Portal the following missing documents: 1- the GEF Data Sheet; and 2- the Cleared Decision Meeting Minutes including comments matrix.
2. It would be helpful if the agency could upload a version of the PAD with the modifications highlighted in yellow (along with a clean version) to clearly indicate where changes were made in the document to facilitate the review process.
3. Please revise the table of content of the PAD as it doesn't include all the document parts (cf the results framework between the risks section and the annexes is not is the table of content).

March 10, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment above on core indicators.

April 27, 2021:

Yes, the project is now recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations