

# Resilient and sustainable livelihoods for rural Yemen

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10562

**Countries**

Yemen

**Project Name**

Resilient and sustainable livelihoods for rural Yemen

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

3/3/2022

**Review completed by PM**

8/25/2022

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**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

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project description summary**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

2022.8.24:

Cleared.

2022.8.4:

On the grant co-financing from FAO (103,580M): Please confirm:

- a. all 6 projects listed in the co-financing letter will be implemented during the GEF project implementation,
- b. the entire reported co-financing amount will be disbursed during the GEF project implementation.

Please also note that to be able to report as Investment Mobilized, the co-financing amount must be available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation, and only reflect the reasonable portion of the baseline project amount which will be supporting the GEF project implementation activities.

2022.3.23:

- There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. The GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional.
- There seems to be drastic change in co-financing ? Donor Agencies that were expected to contribute more than \$7 million at PIF stage are all gone and now co-financing is expected from different institutions. Please provide explanation to this change.
- No evidence is provided for co-financing from Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.

## Agency Response

2022.8.4

The Agency confirms that there is a geographic and time overlap between the GEF project and the baseline projects. Please, consider the timelines of each project, mentioned in the project descriptions starting page 52 of the ProDoc. Also consider the total amounts of the baseline investments mentioned in the same tables, and the portions of mobilised investments from these larger investments. The amounts have been calculating deducted the amounts already disbursed and amounts concerning geographies outside of the project areas from the baseline project budgets. Furthermore, only relevant investments are considered, in addition to the geographic and time considerations.

2022.3.23

- Please, note that the PMC figures have been updated to reflect proportionality.
- Please, see the updated description of investment mobilized, providing clarity.

The redistribution reflects the complexity of the institutional context in the country. Grants previously delivered through ministries are now delivered through UN System

Agencies or international development partners. Co-financing available from Government of Yemen is extremely limited. FAO supports a broad range of investments that will serve as co-financing. FAO's co-financing comprises initiatives funded by the Netherlands, KFW, GCF, the European Commission, and the World Bank.

The co-financing from relevant Ministries, however small, reflects the full interest and engagement of these partners in the project.

- The co-financing letter from the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Fisheries has been added.

#### **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 Yes

Agency Response

**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 Yes

Agency Response

**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

2022.6.11:

Cleared.

2022.3.23:

- Core Indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices) presents a reduction of 15,000 ha for indicator 4.3 (Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in

production systems) from PIF to CEO endorsement stage. Please provide an explanation for such reduction.

- Core Indicator 5 (Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit) does not include a figure for CEO Endorsement stage, please provide a current estimate.

- The proposed project activities to mainstream climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and SLM across productive agriculture, livestock and fisheries sector should contribute to mitigation of GHG emissions. Please provide an estimate of emissions reductions using the FAO-EXACT tool.

- For Core Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment, please provide a justification for the reduction of the estimate number of beneficiaries from PIF to CEO endorsement stage. The 50% male/female projected ratio might be unrealistic given the nature of proposed project activities (agriculture, fisheries) and the conflict and fragility affected situation, please explain.

- Please provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided in the space below the indicators table in the CEO Endorsement template.

### Agency Response

- Well-noted and apologies for the erroneous entry. The numbers should be consistent with PIF, as no changes in reasoning were made during PPG. The ambition of the project was confirmed. This is now reflected in the relevant section of the Portal.

- Idem as above.

- FAO-EXACT was applied and direct and indirect carbon benefits featured in relevant sections of the CER.

- The project anticipates gender parity, and will secure the needed means to have women benefit as much as men from GEF/LDCF investments. At the farm level, men and women are equally engaged. Although representation of women is relatively low in the fishing industry, women are largely responsible for livestock production in Yemen.

- Space below Table F now includes: a brief explanatory note, table for EXACT calculations and table presenting intended Aichi Targets.

### 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

2022.7.19:

Clear

2022.7.14:

Thank you for revising ToC. 'Outputs' and 'Outcomes' are now consistent with Table B. Please also delineate casual pathways between each items where possible. Please refer to examples in the STAP primer on ToC (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>); for instance, Figure3, 5 and 6.

2022.6.11:

On ToC, please also include 'Outputs' and match/link 'Outcomes' with those indicated in Table B. Also, please indicate casual 'pathways' between each items e.g., barriers, interventions/Outputs, Outcomes etc.

2022.3.23:

Climate change and its impact in Yemen are discussed; however, linkage between this discussion and the overall rationale of the project is not clear. The project should have strong climate change adaptation argument and rationale as more than 60% of the GEF investment to this project is requested from CCA. The proposal appears to be more LD/BD project, focusing on primarily on the 'open-access' issue, rather than on CCA matters. For instance, discussion on ecosystem-based adaptation could further be elaborated and strengthened in the context of EBA in Yemen, why it is needed from the climate adaptation point of view, while also potentially benefiting LD/BD, how this will solve/reduce/avoid current barriers, what will be done under the project and how that will be contributing to the overall project goal etc. In addition, clearer ToC could also help strengthen the CCA rationale. Although a ToC is discussed in the proposal, casual pathways that lead to the ultimate goal of the project, from the root cause, through barriers, activities, outputs, outcomes etc. are unclear. Project Objective is clearly stated as 'to assist rural Yemenis to realize sustainable and resilient livelihoods that mainstream climate change adaptation'; however, the pathways that we can ensure that lead to this goal are not as clear as compared to the BD/LD. Please elaborate this by further providing a diagram etc. per STAP primer on ToC (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>). In addition, in the current proposal, Component 1 prioritizes 'conservation', and Component 2 mainstreams 'conservation'. For example, can 'conservation' be rephrased to 'climate resilience' and modify the discussion under each Component to reflect this change? There are bits and pieces of good climate change adaptation rationale here and there in the proposal, such as the fishing practices in Socotra etc.: 'over-fishing limits the capacity of local residents to cope with climate change impacts.' CCA justification and discussion do not just seem to be in the center of the project rationale.

Agency Response

18 June

Thank you for the additional comment. Please, consider the updates and insertion of the 3 causal pathways, which are colour-coded and shown with arrows.

11 June

Please, consider the additions and amendments made to the TOC diagram.

23 March

- The EBA comments is well noted. Additional language has been provided to complete the reasoning.

Any action that intends to enhance climate change resilience for rural Yemenis generally needs to prioritize both ecosystem conservation and commensurate adaptive production improvements. Climate change, ecosystem integrity, and rural livelihoods are fully inter-connected in Yemen. Fisheries, agriculture, and livestock are the foundations of Yemen's rural economy and food security. Each of these sectors depends upon ecosystems that are healthy and intact. Unfortunately, the ecosystems upon which they depend are each under immense pressure from unsustainable practices. Advancing climate change is increasing pressure on already degraded ecosystems and further disrupting production security for at-risk rural Yemenis.

This was detailed by climate change impact and vulnerability analysis completed during the PPG and captured throughout the project document. The project's theory of change is founded upon the recognition that conservation of the ecosystems upon which rural Yemenis depend is critical to any effective climate change adaption and resiliency strategy. Recognizing the symbiotic relationship between ecosystem health, human health and climate change threats supports the "Healthy Planet, Healthy People" framework. The causal reasoning aligns with GEF programming directions by emphasizing integrated approaches that improve ecosystem conservation as part of an enduring climate change adaptation strategy.

Agriculture, livestock and fisheries are the foundations upon which rural Yemenis depend for food security and livelihoods. Ecosystem degradation and climate change threaten each sector. Often, these challenges are completely entwined with climate change and unsustainable production practices cumulatively exerting immense and increasingly complex pressures upon Yemen's fragile ecosystems.

Warming oceans and rising sea levels alter and degrade marine life and habitats already threatened by unsustainable fishing practices. Inconsistent rainfall patterns and rising temperatures challenge agriculture across landscapes already threatened by unsustainable practices. Conservation of plant and tree species responsible for moisture capture and retention are critical to a successful climate change adaptation strategy, yet these ecosystems are already threatened by over-grazing.

Tackling CCA challenges demands a project approach that fundamentally addresses ecosystem conservation as part of a comprehensive and effective CCA strategy. As noted in the project document, open access management is often the primary driver of degradation and, therefore, climate risk exposure particularly for fisheries and livestock. If the ecosystems upon which these activities depend are not conserved and elasticity maintained, they risk complete collapse under the additionality of climate change.

- Comment regarding the Theory Of Change diagram

Well noted. A TOC diagram has now been included, right after the descriptive TOC.

- Comment regarding Component 1 and 2

This is well noted. Components 1 and 2 were rephrased to emphasize CC resilience. Descriptive paragraphs were added to the Proposed Theory of Change to stress and prioritize CC resilience aspects. The Outcomes, activities, and results framework each highlight the importance of CC.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2022.6.11:

Cleared.

2022.3.23:

- Please refer to comment in Part II-1.

- Three landscapes have been selected for project demonstration activities: The Socotra Archipelago, Al-Maharah Governate, and the Central Highlands. Each location was selected based upon factors including presence of biodiversity of global significance and eroding rapidly, presence of unsustainable production practices in agriculture, livestock and fisheries sectors with a potential to introducing sustainable practices, including SLM, impact of climate change and CCA priorities, security, and probability of

successful outcomes. Rural producers in each location face challenges stemming from unsustainable production activities, including agriculture, livestock and fisheries sectors.

It is highly recommended that the project ensures full community participation in the management of the proposed land and seascapes. Project staffing should include social specialists to provide support and guidance to all aspects of community-related activities. Engagement with the GEF-funded Global Wildlife Program (GWP) is recommend, particularly with the "communities of practice" on Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) and Nature Based Tourism (NBC), for best practices and knowledge management experiences in over 30 countries

(<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/24805f3c02de835dcd8bc642f95952b5-0320072021/original/GWP-Annual-Report-2020-low-res.pdf>).

### Agency Response

- Noted with thanks.

- Noted with appreciation. Local communities and particularly local agriculture, fishery, and livestock interests are the project's primary targets. Building the capacities of these stakeholders to improve climate change resiliency through improved production practices designed to maintain ecosystems is the project's intention.

As such, the project foresees that all staff and contractors will be tasked with working closely with local communities. Augmenting this with social specialists to provide guidance "beyond the gender and communications specialists listed" is a strong suggestion and one that will be taken on board during inception.

Please, note that there is a full time sociologist part of the project team, and her/his role will be "among others" to secure proper stakeholder participation, proposing the adequate mechanisms and tools to do so, creating space to secure balanced and equal participation of different interest groups.

- This is well noted, particularly as the GWP expands beyond illegal wildlife trafficking under GEF-6 and becomes more expansive under GEF-7, e.g., programming related to sustainable development and wildlife valuation through habitat conservation and resilient wildlife-based economies.

The project document now references the GWP.

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to comment in Part II-1.

Agency Response Noted above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to comment in Part II-1.

Agency Response Noted above.

**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

Please refer to comment in Part II-1.

Agency Response Noted above.

**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

Yes

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**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

Yes

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

## Agency Response

### Coordination

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2022.7.14:

Cleared.

2022.6.11:

Please reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet in the CEOER.

2022.3.23:

As three locations proposed in Yemen are dispersed and geographically isolated, coordination (transportation, logistics, communication etc.) is expected to be complex, and this could be further exacerbated by the ongoing pandemic and conflict. As such, please further elaborate on this point, so that we can ensure effective and safe coordination are going to take place.

## Agency Response

11 June

Please, see the explanation featured in the ProDoc, section 6.a Institutional arrangements for project implementation.

23 March

Lessons learned during the PPG phase (for which partners and contractors were mobilised to conduct stakeholder engagement and HH surveys for instance) as well as FAO's on-the-ground project implementation experience are reflected and integrated within the project design, including making certain transportation, logistics, and communications are well coordinated. As noted in the project document, a central project office will be detailed with coordinating implementation. This office will be supported by field staff located at each of the project sites. Travel between these three sites is challenged. However, electronic communications between sites is generally reliable and travel between the highlands and Sana'a is reasonably easy. Access to Socotra and Hawf are generally viable via third-party countries. These elements have been considered, as well as the cost, in order to operate properly in the highly constrained Yemeni context.

## **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

Yes

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2022.7.14:

Cleared.

2022.6.11:

Please reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet in the CEOER.

2022.3.23:

As three locations proposed in Yemen are dispersed and geographically isolated, knowledge and experience sharing between different sites can be expected to be complex, and this could be further exacerbated by the ongoing pandemic and conflict.

As such, please further elaborate on this point, so that we can ensure effective and efficient knowledge sharing plan exists.

Agency Response

11 June

Please, see text added in section 8 Knowledge Management of the ProDoc.

23 March

As noted above, the project design reflects PPG lessons and FAO experience. Effective and efficient knowledge sharing will be facilitated by the main project office situated in Sana'a. Although travel between sites is challenging, electronic communication is quite reliable. The communication and knowledge management strategies discussed within the project document reflect these challenges. This will be facilitated through electronic sharing of knowledge, e.g., project website, YouTube channels, etc.

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2022.10.20:

Cleared.

2022.9.14:

- Thank you for further clarifications re vehicles - approved.
- The majority of the tasks associated with SENIOR TECHNICAL ADVISOR seems to be M&E related and the relevance to Components /Outcomes/Outputs is not clear. Please clarify this relevance; perhaps by adding brackets after each task for example: ? Contribute to the definition of the M&E plan, securing high standard qualitative and quantitative indicators of progress, capturing the multiple dimensions of the project success (Component X; Output X).

TOR for NATIONAL PROJECT COORDINATOR could also be updated in a similar manner.

2022.8.24:

- Vehicle: please clarify the number of vehicles to be purchased for each site/component.
- Senior technical advisor: It was not possible to find out the TORs for the Senior Technical Advisor.
- National project coordinator: TOR seems to be mainly management tasks without specific deliverables to project components. As such, please fully charge the costs to the PMC or provide an appropriate TOR that would reflect the contributions/deliverables of this position to the components to which hers/his costs are charged.

2022.8.4:

- Annex A: Please include/reflect core indicator 6 in the results framework (Annex A).
- Annex B: It looks like the comment from the Council member from the US was not addressed. Please provide an answer in Annex B of the Portal.
- Budget: The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. 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.
- Budget: Project Coordinator and senior technical advisor are being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds ? which for this projects is not the case), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 2.5 Million, of which 103 million is represented in grants.

National consultants										
National Project Coordinator (Sana'a)	National coordinator for project implementation	\$88,333	\$88,333	\$88,333	~	\$50,000	\$915,000	\$135,000	~	\$180,000
S013 International Consultants										
Senior Advisor	Part-time technical advisor. Additional time potentially cost-shared with FAC/Yemen.	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	~	~	\$540,000	\$231,429	~	\$308,571

## Agency Response

October 2022

Please, see the updated TORs of both the Senior Technical Advisor and the National Project Coordinator. The suggestions have been followed to clarify nature of tasks.

September 2022

- The 9 vehicles will be entirely used at the site level, not in the capital. Therefore, there are 3 vehicles per site. Please, do note that these vehicles are not the classical SUVs, but rather flexible and solar powered 4x4 vehicles (e.g. <https://ranger.polaris.com/en-us/ranger-500/> ; <https://www.yamahamotorsports.com/utility-side-by-side/models/viking-vi-eps-ranch-edition> <https://ranger.polaris.com/en-us/ranger-cv/> ) that are better suited for the un-updated roads, terrain and lack of infrastructure. These vehicles also have low maintenance costs. The large areas of the project sites and the lack of an existing and reliable carpool for project partners (as highlighted earlier, only FAO has an existing carpool to make available, where already operational) and project staff require the introduction of additional vehicles in order to efficiently deliver the many field based project activities.
- Please, see the TORs of the Senior Technical Advisor attached in the Annex O of the project document.
- Please, do consider the breakdown of the NPC's tasks into technical tasks and management tasks in the TORs in Annex O of the project document. Largest part of the time, the NPC - considering the extent and depth of the technical tasks listed - will be dedicated to technical work, hence the distribution of her/his cost over the different project components.

Earlier responses

- The carbon benefit has been added to the results matrix of the project.
- The US comments have been addressed.
- The use and purchase of vehicles has been carefully considered for this project. National partners do not have a car pool to rely upon for project execution. FAO, through its co-financing will make cars available for the use of the project management unit and decentralised teams. However, the projects are very large. They are in 3 distinct and remote geographies. Partners and beneficiaries alike are scattered and have little to no means to connect, also due to poor road quality. The purchase of petrol as well as solar powered side by side vehicles (agile and less reliant on existing infrastructure than regular 4x4 and SUVs, and less costly in maintenance) is considered indispensable in order to deliver this ambitious and multifaceted project. Acknowledging and fully comprehending the vehicles do not directly deliver GEBs, please do note that the cost of the purchase represents less than 1,5% of the GEF grant, though they will connect partners and help with a timely delivery of project results.
- Please, do note that the senior advisor has no management role, but a technical advisory role exclusively. That is why her/his cost is budgeted under the technical components of the project. As for the national project coordinator, please do consider the TORs shared in Annex O of the project document. The functions in the TORs are presented as technical functions and administrative/management functions, therefore justifying the split of the NPC cost over technical components and PMC. The NPC will be 100% dedicated to the GEF project, and a reasonable salary will be proposed in order to secure interest from senior and qualified candidates, and in order to secure continuity through time. The GEF grant is therefore covering a large part of the NPC cost, but not all. Indeed, the large co-

finance to technical components and PMC secures the engagement of qualified candidates on a full-time and multi-year basis. Co-financing will be critical for the following consultants to be on-boarded: operational support, senior advisor, M&E, national technical assistants, and administrative and financial management. GEF grant resources alone cannot engage these consultants on a full-time basis for the full duration of the project.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2022.8.24:

Cleared.

2022.8.4:

It looks like the comment from the Council member from the US was not addressed.

Please provide an answer in Annex B of the Portal.

Agency Response

Apologies for the oversight. Please, note that the compilation document (GEF C.58 compilation council comments v1.pdf (thegef.org)) is incomplete. Answers have been added.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

2022.10.20:

This CEOER is recommended for technical clearance.

2022.9.14 /2022.8.24 /2022.8.4 /2022.7.14 /2022.6.11 /2022.3.23:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the change).

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/23/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/11/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/14/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/19/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/4/2022</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**