



Preserving Suriname's Immense Marine and Coastal Biodiversity through Greening Infrastructure Development

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11472

Countries

Suriname

Project Name

Preserving Suriname's Immense Marine and Coastal Biodiversity through Greening Infrastructure Development

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

12/13/2024

Review completed by PM

2/24/2025

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared.

HF April 7, 2025

1.) Clear

3.) They are still inconsistent. Please revise.

HF February 2025

1.) Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified under key risk table.

3.) Please adjust the rating under the "Environmental and Social" risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the "Environmental and Social" risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: "The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage."

Response to Secretariat comments

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/14/2025):

3. This is noted. The Risk Table overall risk rating has been corrected to be "low" risk, in line with the overall social safeguards rating and the line in the risk table indicating social and environmental risk.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

1. The overall risk rating is moderate, an explanation has been provided under the risk table.

3. Thank you, the rating has been adjusted "the overall risk rating and the risk category line on "environmental and social risk" are now both listed as low.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Clear. See below on KMGBF.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared. PM approves PMC above 5% threshold given explanation below and the fact that the GEFTF amount for this project (\$2.3 mio) is very close to the \$2 mill which would trigger a 10% PMC threshold and country and project conditions justify a slightly higher PMC amount.

c.iii.) 3.1.1 refers to "shortlist and development". What does "development" mean in this context? Please further explain what is planned under 3.1.

f.) The PMC is 7.5% of the total budget, correct? Projects over \$2 million have a PMC cap of 5%. Given that, please submit a justification for a higher PMC amount for this project. The justification may be included as a budget note for the PMC amount, and please email this to the project PM for review and approval. This will be considered as an exception on a case-by-case basis.

Others are cleared.

HF February 6, 2025

c.i) GAP AND OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS: It will be important to have the gap and opportunity analysis (Output 1.1.1) completed early on so that the project will have enough time to draft regulations and legislation as covered in 1.1.2. Annex C on Results Framework mentions that this will be done by Year 2.

c.ii) Outcome 1.2 refers to strengthened mandates; it could be useful to clarify who this refers to. The detailed descriptions further down in the document clarifies this, but would be handy for the readers to have it stated in the outcome too.

c.iii) 3.1.1 should be revised to be a project output, rather than input (e.g. TA). Please further develop component 3.

c.iv) SUSTAINABILITY OF PLATFORMS: How will the Multistakeholder platform (Output 2.1.2.) be sustained beyond the duration of this GEF project? Where will it be hosted? Same questions apply to the Platform/database for transparency in the permitting process (Output 2.2.3).

c. v) ENABLING FINANCING MECHANISMS: Under outcome 3.1, it is stated that selected mechanisms will be identified during implementation given the high pace of change in this area. While this is a reasonable approach, it will be important to identify possible approaches early on and make sure that the outcome leads to concrete results. Experience from other IPs shows that this type of work can be challenging without a clear roadmap. The Global Platform should also be able to provide guidance, support and best practices with regards to financial mechanisms.

d.i) The contribution and engagement with the global platform is generally well covered.

d.ii) GENDER: Specific information on gender and women's involvement is largely missing from project description. The Gender analysis and action plan identified gaps and provides recommendations. Please incorporate and mainstream these in the project description.

d.iii) Under Monitoring and Evaluation, please ensure that MTR and TE report on the implementation of gender-specific actions, including those in the Gender Action Plan.

Response to Secretariat comments

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/16/2025):

c.iii. Development refers to structuring/designing the financial mechanisms so they are ready to be in place and deployed by the end of the project (e.g. updating with Ministry of Public Works their procurement guidelines to incorporate GRID considerations, recommending and proposing text for the Co-Investment Fund related to GRID, etc). This will be complemented by socialization and capacity building. Additional text has been added to 3.1.

f. The justification was provided in the previous submission, please see screenshot below:

Component Balances

Project Components	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Enabling Conditions for nature positive / sustainable transportation infrastructure	683,630.00	2,068,371.00
Component 2: Integrated and inclusive transportation infrastructure planning	878,040.00	2,656,573.00
Component 3: Finance and de-risking mechanisms	227,120.00	687,168.00
Component 4: Knowledge management, communications, and coordination	215,028.00	650,583.00
M&E	165,580.00	500,974.00
Subtotal	2,169,398.00	6,563,669.00
Project Management Cost	177,080.00	535,768.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	2,346,478.00	7,099,437.00

Please provide Justification

PMC increase justification:

The proposed increase in the PMC is necessary to ensure a competitive PMU with dedicated time to project management and financial management. The 5% PMC cap is around \$110,000. Based on the due diligence assessment, annual independent audits are required, which have been estimated at \$60,000 over 4 years. \$50,000 for other project management-related expenses over 4 years is insufficient to cover the necessary staff time related to project management and financial management. Therefore, an increase to the PMC is requested (8.16% of the subtotal).

In the current resubmission, this has been updated and this same note has been added below the budget in the attached budget word document.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

c. ii. Thank you, the gap analysis will be completed year 1 ? this has been reflected in the results framework and the high-level workplan. Please note that year 1 includes 6 months of start-up activities (recruiting the PMU, developing the Y1 workplan, etc).

c. ii. This has been clarified in the outcome language

c.iii. The output language has been revised, and additional information for Component 3 has been provided.

c. iv. The Multistakeholder Platform (Output 2.1.2) will be supported during the project to support delivery of specific outputs. Stakeholder engagement processes will then continue and be institutionalized on the Geo-Spatial Hub that ROM is currently developing; the Hub will feature an interactive platform for stakeholder engagement.

The platform/database for transparency (Output 2.2.3) will also be hosted on the Geo-Spatial Hub that ROM is building out, and which ROM will maintain long-term.

c. v. Thank you, and agreed ? the project will work to identify possible approaches early and develop a strong roadmap with advice from the Global Platform. This outcome will depend on strong partnerships, as the project will look to support and build on upcoming mechanisms rather than start something new. This has been further expanded in the narrative.

d. ii. A Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) approach has been better integrated into the project description, as well as throughout the document.

d. iii. The MTR and TE will include reporting on the implementation of gender-specific actions, this has been included more explicitly in the project description table and in Annex 2 (M&E Plan).

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025

Cleared.

HF February 12, 2025

5.1.a) to c.) Clear.

d.) Component 1: Outcome 1.2 on capacity building, what are the opportunities for institutionalization of capacity-building efforts, e.g. mainstreaming or inclusion in civil servant or engineering training programs, secondary education etc versus one-off approach which may not have impact over time.

g.) Yes.

j.) Please ensure that key elements/actions included in the Gender Action Plan are clearly indicated/included in the CER, currently it just references the attachment rather than integrates it into the design.

m.) No, please address this criteria in the review sheet and project design/CER.

Response to Secretariat comments

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

d. Opportunities and plans for institutionalizing capacity building efforts in civil servant programs, academia, and private sector (engineers) has been added to the Outcome 1.2 narrative description.

j. Thank you, the elements from the Gender Action Plan are now better integrated into the CER text.

m. The levers of transformation, innovation, and the scaling-up approach is now included in the project description.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025:

1.) Private sector: This is an area that needs to be further developed during project inception and early implementation and planning.

2.) The institutionalization of capacity-building efforts, e.g. mainstreaming or inclusion in civil servant or engineering training programs, secondary education etc versus one-off approach which may not have impact over time is a critical sustainability measure. Please further develop in project inception and early implementation.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/24/2025	4/3/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2025	4/16/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

HF May 2, 2025:

Yes, PM cleared for Council 4 week review and endorsement prior to 2nd cancellation deadline (August 9, 2025).

HF April, 2025:

Not yet. Please address comments in review sheet, make commensurate revisions to documentation and resubmit noting what changes were made and where (including section etc).

HF February, 2025:

Not yet. Please address comments in review sheet, make commensurate revisions to documentation and resubmit noting what changes were made and where.

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 6, 2024

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 6, 2024

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) 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 outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 6, 2024

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) 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?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared. PM approves PMC above 5% threshold given explanation below and the fact that the GEFTF amount for this project (\$2.3 mio) is very close to the \$2 mill which would trigger a 10% PMC threshold and country and project conditions justify a slightly higher PMC amount.

c.iii.) 3.1.1 refers to "shortlist and development". What does "development" mean in this context? Please further explain what is planned under 3.1.

f.) The PMC is 7.5% of the total budget, correct? Projects over \$2 million have a PMC cap of 5%. Given that, please submit a justification for a higher PMC amount for this project. The justification may be included as a budget note for the PMC amount, and please email this to the project PM for review and approval. This will be considered as an exception on a case-by-case basis.

Others are cleared.

HF February 6, 2025

c.i) GAP AND OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS: It will be important to have the gap and opportunity analysis (Output 1.1.1) completed early on so that the project will have enough time to draft regulations and legislation as covered in 1.1.2. Annex C on Results Framework mentions that this will be done by Year 2.

c.ii) Outcome 1.2 refers to strengthened mandates; it could be useful to clarify who this refers to. The detailed descriptions further down in the document clarifies this, but would be handy for the readers to have it stated in the outcome too.

c.iii) 3.1.1 should be revised to be a project output, rather than input (e.g. TA). Please further develop component 3.

c.iv) SUSTAINABILITY OF PLATFORMS: How will the Multistakeholder platform (Output 2.1.2.) be sustained beyond the duration of this GEF project? Where will it be hosted? Same questions apply to the Platform/database for transparency in the permitting process (Output 2.2.3).

c. v) ENABLING FINANCING MECHANISMS: Under outcome 3.1, it is stated that selected mechanisms will be identified during implementation given the high pace of change in this area. While this is a reasonable approach, it will be important to identify possible approaches early on and make sure that the outcome leads to concrete results. Experience from other IPs shows that this type of work can be challenging without a clear roadmap. The Global Platform should also be able to provide guidance, support and best practices with regards to financial mechanisms.

d.i) The contribution and engagement with the global platform is generally well covered.

d.ii) GENDER: Specific information on gender and women's involvement is largely missing from project description. The Gender analysis and action plan identified gaps and provides recommendations. Please incorporate and mainstream these in the project description.

d.iii) Under Monitoring and Evaluation, please ensure that MTR and TE report on the implementation of gender-specific actions, including those in the Gender Action Plan.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/16/2025):

c.iii. Development refers to structuring/designing the financial mechanisms so they are ready to be in place and deployed by the end of the project (e.g. updating with Ministry of Public Works their procurement guidelines to incorporate GRID considerations, recommending and proposing text for the Co-Investment Fund related to GRID, etc). This will be complemented by socialization and capacity building. Additional text has been added to 3.1.

f. The justification was provided in the previous submission, please see screenshot below:

Component Balances

Project Components	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Enabling Conditions for nature positive / sustainable transportation infrastructure	683,630.00	2,068,371.00
Component 2: Integrated and inclusive transportation infrastructure planning	878,040.00	2,656,573.00
Component 3: Finance and de-risking mechanisms	227,120.00	687,168.00
Component 4: Knowledge management, communications, and coordination	215,028.00	650,583.00
M&E	165,580.00	500,974.00
Subtotal	2,169,398.00	6,563,669.00
Project Management Cost	177,080.00	535,768.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	2,346,478.00	7,099,437.00

Please provide Justification

PMC increase justification:

The proposed increase in the PMC is necessary to ensure a competitive PMU with dedicated time to project management and financial management. The 5% PMC cap is around \$110,000. Based on the due diligence assessment, annual independent audits are required, which have been estimated at \$60,000 over 4 years. \$50,000 for other project management-related expenses over 4 years is insufficient to cover the necessary staff time related to project management and financial management. Therefore, an increase to the PMC is requested (8.16% of the subtotal).

In the current resubmission, this has been updated and this same note has been added below the budget in the attached budget word document.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

c. ii. Thank you, the gap analysis will be completed year 1 ? this has been reflected in the results framework and the high-level workplan. Please note that year 1 includes 6 months of start-up activities (recruiting the PMU, developing the Y1 workplan, etc).

c. ii. This has been clarified in the outcome language

c.iii. The output language has been revised, and additional information for Component 3 has been provided.

c. iv. The Multistakeholder Platform (Output 2.1.2) will be supported during the project to support delivery of specific outputs. Stakeholder engagement processes will then continue and be institutionalized on the Geo-Spatial Hub that ROM is currently developing; the Hub will feature an interactive platform for stakeholder engagement.

The platform/database for transparency (Output 2.2.3) will also be hosted on the Geo-Spatial Hub that ROM is building out, and which ROM will maintain long-term.

c. v. Thank you, and agreed ? the project will work to identify possible approaches early and develop a strong roadmap with advice from the Global Platform. This outcome will depend on strong partnerships, as the project will look to support and build on upcoming mechanisms rather than start something new. This has been further expanded in the narrative.

d. ii. A Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) approach has been better integrated into the project description, as well as throughout the document.

d. iii. The MTR and TE will include reporting on the implementation of gender-specific actions, this has been included more explicitly in the project description table and in Annex 2 (M&E Plan).

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025:

Cleared.

b.) Cleared. Private sector: This is an area that needs to be further developed during project inception and early implementation and planning. Included this below.

HF February 10, 2025:

a.) Some diagrams, including 'Gaps, Barriers, and Enablers' on page 13, are blurry and difficult to read. Please retry the upload or attach as a separate file.

b.) PRIVATE SECTOR: Given that private actors are involved in port development to a high degree, and most ports are privately funded, please better elaborate on how the private sector will be involved, including through the multi-stakeholder platform. Please better define the different types of private sector actors that the project needs to engage with; MSMEs, local businesses, international firms, etc.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

- a. The diagrams have been re-uploaded at hopefully higher quality.
- b. Private sector involvement is key; private sector will be engaged in almost all outputs, and be included in the steering committee and in the multi-stakeholder engagement platform. Private sector involvement has been updated throughout the text, specifically under Outcome 1.2, Outcome 2.1, and in the stakeholder engagement section under project description.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to

project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025

Cleared.

HF February 12, 2025

5.1.a) to c.) Clear.

d.) Component 1: Outcome 1.2 on capacity building, what are the opportunities for institutionalization of capacity-building efforts, e.g. mainstreaming or inclusion in civil servant or engineering training programs, secondary education etc versus one-off approach which may not have impact over time.

g.) Yes.

j.) Please ensure that key elements/actions included in the Gender Action Plan are clearly indicated/included in the CER, currently it just references the attachment rather than integrates it into the design.

m.) No, please address this criteria in the review sheet and project design/CER.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

d. Opportunities and plans for institutionalizing capacity building efforts in civil servant programs, academia, and private sector (engineers) has been added to the Outcome 1.2 narrative description.

j. Thank you, the elements from the Gender Action Plan are now better integrated into the CER text.

m. The levers of transformation, innovation, and the scaling-up approach is now included in the project description.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 2025

Cleared.

HF February 2025

- a.) The organigram and text do not seem to include reference to the engagement and relationship between the GEF Agency and the GRID global coordination project, please address.
- b.) NA
- c.) No-please address.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

- a. Thank you, this has been addressed in the organigram and narrative.
- c. A description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects has been added.

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared.

HF April 7, 2025

a.i.) **CI4 - Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas).** We noticed that the project is expected to improve practices in 2,500 ha by informing road placement and supporting integrated planning. Please clarify whether the project will be claiming GHG avoidance from these improved practices. If so, this should be included in the target and calculations for Core Indicator 6.

a.ii) **GHG reductions from coastal wetlands (mangroves).** There is a minor inconsistency in the GHG numbers. As per the EX-Act Tool (see screenshot below), without the proposed project the final ha of mangrove in the project area is expected to be 608 ha, i.e., a total lost of 172 ha (780 ha ? 608 ha). This is slightly inconsistent with the total ha loss as per the CEO Endorsement, i.e., 180 ha. Likewise, the CEO Endorsement document states that the total ha of mangrove to be protective by the proposed project is 27 ha, while as per the EX-Act Tool is 16 ha (624 ha ? 608 ha). Please address this minor inconsistency and update the final tCO₂ eq avoided in both the EX-Act Tool and the CEO Endorsement document.

b.) cleared.

HF February 10, 2025

a.) Please include a target for Core Indicator 6 at CEO endorsement request stage, as well as updated ExAct calculations to support the target.

b.) Number of beneficiaries is very low (300), consider revising upwards, please include defensible target including all those who could be expected to benefit from the work of the project, not just the direct participants in activities.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/16/2025):

a.i. The project will help to mitigate/avoid GHG emissions in the 2,500 hectares by improving secondary road placement (with carbon mitigation potential/attribution in approximately 175 ha of this area), in addition to influencing port development. The EX-ACT tool has been updated.

a.ii. The ExACT tool has been adjusted to reflect a loss of 180 hectares of mangroves without the project and a protection of 27 hectares with the project. The final number of TCO₂e is reflected in the core indicators table and encompasses the additional protected area mentioned above.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

- a. A target for Core Indicator 6 has been included for 23,736 metric tons of CO2e mitigated.
- b. The direct number of beneficiaries will be 300 (based on the GEF's definition and indicator guidelines). The indirect beneficiaries will be much higher (242,946 people); the methodology has been updated in the core indicator description.

5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared.

HF April 7, 2025

1.) Clear

3.) They are still inconsistent. Please revise.

HF February 2025

1.) Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified under key risk table.

3.) Please adjust the rating under the "Environmental and Social" risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the "Environmental and Social" risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: "The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage."

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/14/2025):

3. This is noted. The Risk Table overall risk rating has been corrected to be "low" risk, in line with the overall social safeguards rating and the line in the risk table indicating social and environmental risk.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

1. The overall risk rating is moderate, an explanation has been provided under the risk table.

3. Thank you, the rating has been adjusted ? the overall risk rating and the risk category line on ?environmental and social risk? are now both listed as low.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

NA

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes, well aligned with GRID PFD.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

a. Contributions to KMGBF targets have been expanded upon in Section C (Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country Priorities), and now shows how the project will contribute to each of the targets identified.

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Clear. See below on KMGBF.

Agency Response

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025

Clear

HF February 10, 2025

a.) Please describe how the project will contribute to each of the KMGBF targets identified.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

a. Contributions to KMGBF targets have been expanded upon in Section C (Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country Priorities), and now shows how the project will contribute to each of the targets identified.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 9, 2025

Clear

HF February 2025

Yes, but elements should be better integrated.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

Thank you, gender and social inclusion considerations have been added.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

NA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

NA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

NA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

NA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025

Cleared

HF February 2025

Please revise the source of co-financing for World Wildlife Fund Guianas and Conservation International Suriname from ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor Agency?.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

Noted, this has been adjusted

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF February 2025

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF April 7, 2025

Cleared

HF February 2025

a.) to c.) Yes.

d.) Yes, but the Regulatory Framework Scorecard is not legible in the CEO endorsement document in the Portal. Please ensure it is legible. We note the annex.

e.) Yes. These are well integrated.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

D. The Framework has been re-uploaded at hopefully a higher quality. A more detailed version is attached in the annex.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025

Cleared

HF February 10, 2025

- Current and planned ports are mentioned on page 8. Please include map(s) of the locations of the ports and depicting relevant places/detail for this project.

-
-

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

A map of current and planned ports is now included in Annex 9, as well as geocoordinates of the relevant ports and in the portal document.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared.

HF April 7, 2025

Again, please make these consistent. The SES are low but the risk section indicates moderate.

HF February 2025

1. We note that WWF-US attached the Environmental and Social Safeguards Categorization Memorandum and Project's environmental and social risk is classified as Low. The project developed stakeholder engagement plan with grievance mechanism. However, the environmental and social risk section of the Key risk table in the portal said Moderate risk. Please make these two different risks consistent.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/14/2025):

This is noted. The Risk Table overall risk rating has been corrected to be 'low' risk, in line with the overall social safeguards rating

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

This has been adjusted, the risk is now listed as low in the table. Key social considerations will still be included in the project.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025

Cleared.

HF April 7 2025

a.) Cleared.

b.) c.) d.) These will be reviewed once the budget has been adjusted to include justification for higher PMC amount.

HF February 2025

- a.) Please include the budget in the CER section Annex G of the Portal (not only as an attachment since Council won't be receiving attachments and needs to see the budget).
- b.) Project manager/technical advisor position is only budgeted \$18,000 out of \$120,000 to PMC, whereas the TOR says that the position is 100% project management (preamble para at top of TOR in attachment). Description of functions in TOR of position portend that the cost could be split across components, M&E and PMC, but the allocation should be more commensurate with the functions described in the TOR (e.g. majority would be shouldered by PMC and M&E with only a small fraction under components).
- c.) Project Manager and Finance/Admin Officer should be charged 100% to PMC. Please separate these positions from others and show the budget allocation to PMC accordingly.
- d.) Office supplies are to be charged 100% to PMC. Please revise the budget.
- c.) Yes.

Agency Response

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/14/2025):

b) c.) The justification for the PMC amount was provided with the previous submission in the first section of the portal.

Component Balances

Project Components	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Enabling Conditions for nature positive / sustainable transportation infrastructure	683,630.00	2,068,371.00
Component 2: Integrated and inclusive transportation infrastructure planning	878,040.00	2,656,573.00
Component 3: Finance and de-risking mechanisms	227,120.00	687,168.00
Component 4: Knowledge management, communications, and coordination	215,028.00	650,583.00
M&E	165,580.00	500,974.00
Subtotal	2,169,398.00	6,563,669.00
Project Management Cost	177,080.00	535,768.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	2,346,478.00	7,099,437.00

Please provide Justification

PMC increase justification:

The proposed increase in the PMC is necessary to ensure a competitive PMU with dedicated time to project management and financial management. The 5% PMC cap is around \$110,000. Based on the due diligence assessment, annual independent audits are required, which have been estimated at \$60,000 over 4 years. \$50,000 for other project management-related expenses over 4 years is insufficient to cover the necessary staff time related to project management and financial management. Therefore, an increase to the PMC is requested (8.16% of the subtotal).

In the most recent version, this has been updated and this same note has been added below the budget in the uploaded word version of the budget.

WWF- GEF Agency Response (04/03/2025):

- a. The budget summary table has been included in Section G, with a detailed component level budget uploaded as a word document.
- b. Thank you, the ToR has been clarified and the budget has been updated.

The Project Manager/Technical Advisor position is now budgeted 45% under PMC (pending approval for PMC increase). The remaining time is under M&E, with some budget included to providing technical expertise across the components and a percentage of time for participation in the GRID IP.

c. The Project Manager/Technical Advisor has a number of functions, as noted above. 45% of the time is now dedicated to PMC. The Finance officer/M&E Specialist is also a split role ? 50% time is budgeted to finance and administration, 50% time is budgeted to M&E (pending approval for PMC increase).

d. Office supplies have been removed; printing and communication supplies are still budgeted as part of stakeholder engagement, communications, and technical workshops.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF May 2, 2025:

Yes, PM cleared for Council 4 week review and endorsement prior to 2nd cancellation deadline (August 9, 2025).

HF April, 2025:

Not yet. Please address comments in review sheet, make commensurate revisions to documentation and resubmit noting what changes were made and where (including section etc).

HF February, 2025:

Not yet. Please address comments in review sheet, make commensurate revisions to documentation and resubmit noting what changes were made and where.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF April 7, 2025:

- 1.) Private sector: This is an area that needs to be further developed during project inception and early implementation and planning.
- 2.) The institutionalization of capacity-building efforts, e.g. mainstreaming or inclusion in civil servant or engineering training programs, secondary education etc versus one-off approach which may not have impact over time is a critical sustainability measure. Please further develop in project inception and early implementation.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/24/2025	4/3/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2025	4/16/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		