

Towards Sustainable Phosphorus Cycles in Lake Catchments (uP-Cycle)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10892

Countries

Global (Chile)

Project Name

Towards Sustainable Phosphorus Cycles in Lake Catchments (uP-Cycle)

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

1/31/2023

Review completed by PM

4/10/2023

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

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

17th of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) The Focal Area outcomes are missed. Please revise accordingly.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) Addressed in the CEO Doc and Portal.

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

17th of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) The GEF financing and co-financing contributions to PMC are not proportional. Please adjust accordingly.

(2) Please remove cents from the Table B figures.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ?30 March 2023

(1) While the existing GEF TF/Co-financing (CF) ratio was barely 2% higher than the total GEF TF/CF ratio, it was amended as per the request. Please note that component 3 CF was therefore augmented accordingly by ~400K to keep the grand CF total the same.

(2) While cents from the Table B figures were removed, note that this was actually done to ensure a 100% match with the co-financing letters.

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

17th of February 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

(1) Dates are missing in the support letters for CRAES, IHE-Delft, UKCEH, PET, EMG GmbH, DGA, and Universidad de La Frontera. Please confirm the date each co-financing letter.

(2) The sources of co-financing for several co-financiers is incorrectly classified as "Donor Agency", including Institute for Water Education (IHE-Delft), Linkoping University, University of Edinburgh, CRAES, WRI, UKCEH, Mar Adentro Foundation, Unversidad de La Frontera, among others. Please re-classify accordingly.

(3) The IHE-Delft co-financing letter includes several original source donors. Please secure individual letters co-financing from these original source donors or remove this co-finance from Table C.

(4) The Linkoping University co-financing letter indicates the co-financing is grant/in-kind. Table C indicates this co-finance is Investment Mobilized. Please seek a revised co-financing letter, which classifies these funds as grant/investment mobilized, or reclassify in Table C to in-kind/recurrent expenditures. This letter notes a contingency upon approval of legal department. Please advise on whether this co-finance is approved.

(5) The University of Edinburgh co-financing letter includes original source donors and co-financing from UNDP (more than \$4M). Please secure individual co-financing letters from these original source donors or remove this co-finance from Table C.

(6) The WRI co-financing letter includes Cargill as an original source donor. Please secure an individual co-financing letter from this original source donor or remove this co-finance from Table C.

(7) The UKCEH co-financing letter lists all co-financing as in-kind. Table C classifies parts of this co-financing as grant/investment mobilized and part as in-kind/recurrent expenditures. Please revise accordingly, either Table C or seek a new co-financing letter.

(8) Following the above requested revisions, please update the description of how any investment mobilized was identified, ensuring that each co-financier providing investment mobilized is specifically named in this section.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Partly addressed. Table C classifies this co-finance as "Grant" and not "In-Kind". Please correct to "In-Kind".

(5) Addressed.

(6) Addressed.

(7) Partly addressed. It is still not clear why part of the 13.9 million is classified as grant, given the Agency explanation notes that this co-financing amounts to "an in-kind investment totalling USD 13.9 million." Please revise to in-kind in Table C.

(8) Addressed.

9th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(4) Addressed.

(7) Addressed.

14th of April 2023 (thenshaw)

(1) Regarding point 1, the explanation is not accepted. Please provide an explicit declaration assuring the co-financing will indeed contribute to the project's objectives in the estimated timeframe between X (date of starting implementation) and Y (date of finalizing implementation). Please upload this declaration (signed by the IA and EA) to the portal and include the declaration text here in the review sheet.

17th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed. A declaration, signed by the Agency and the executing entity, is uploaded to the portal and states: "This is to confirm the forward-looking nature of all of the uP-Cycle MSP (GEF ID # 10892) co-financing including specifically co-financing from CRAES, IHE-Delft, UKCEH, PET, EMG GmbH, DGA, and Universidad de La Frontera. All co-financing will contribute to the project objective and the delivery of each of its components... It has been estimated to support project execution from June 2023 to June 2025." The declaration also includes a table that maps co-financing to component delivery.

Agency Response

Agency Response ?30 March 2023

1) Note that all CF confirmation letters including from CRAES, IHE-Delft, UKCEH, PET, EMG GmbH, DGA, and Universidad de La Frontera were received by UK/CEH between November and December 2022 although dates are not reflected in the support letters.

(2) The sources of co-financing for Institute for Water Education (IHE-Delft), Linkoping University, University of Edinburgh, CRAES, WRI, UKCEH, Mar Adentro Foundation, Universidad de La Frontera and others were adjusted to read others and CSO as relevant.

(3) While many of our co-financiers including IHE-Delft have accounted for different co-financing sources in their co-financing confirmation letters, it should be noted that this was done for clarity and transparency but that all sources accounted for in every co-financing letter are solely managed by the writer of the co-financing letter as recipient of such co-financing. Thus, we do not believe, it warrants several co-financing letters from the original sources split by ?sub?-funding sources, nor do we believe it should be removed despite the high GEF/non GEF co-financing ratio of 1:23 as it serves as counterpart funding from parallel initiatives in support of the GEF funded activities.

(4) The Linkoping University co-financing letter actually indicates that the co-financing is in kind. As it corresponds to parallel initiatives in support of the project and not to staff time, it is accounted for as in-kind Investment Mobilized as done in previous other submissions. Indeed, such investments mobilised, while grant to the co-financiers are not a grant to our project given that such resources will not be managed/controlled jointly with the GEF grant thru the project coordination unit. In a follow up correspondence with the signatory of the Linkoping University (13/03/2023) co-finance letter it was confirmed that the clause would be lifted on authorisation of the project.

(5) and (6) As stated above, while many of our co-financiers including the University of Edinburgh and WRI have accounted for different co-financing sources (incl. UNDP and

Cargill's funding respectively) in their co-financing confirmation letters, it should be noted that this was done for clarity and transparency but that all sources accounted for in every co-financing letter are solely managed by the writer of the co-financing letter as recipient of such co-financing. Thus, we do not believe, it warrants several co-financing letters from the original sources split by sub-funding sources, nor do we believe it should be removed despite the high GEF/non GEF co-financing ratio of 1:23 as it serves as counterpart funding from parallel initiatives in support of the GEF funded activities. Further, in the case of WRI, the co-financing offered thru their institution provides the opportunity to partner with the private sector and we would not want to miss this. It is indeed a collaborative relationship combining WRI's cutting-edge tools for business with Cargill's insights and expertise from working with food and agriculture communities in over 70 countries around the world. WRI and Cargill's shared values include the application of standardized accounting, science-based methodologies and the development of open-source tools, including the Aqueduct product visualizing nutrient emissions and impacts globally. In contrast, the UNDP funding listed for the University of Edinburgh refers to The Strata: Earth Stress monitor will present results from continuous Environmental and Climate Stress monitoring project, a collaboration between the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the University of Edinburgh, and Earth Blox.

(7) It should be noted that while the UKCEH co-financing letter lists all co-financing as in-kind, it corresponds to an in-kind investment totalling USD 13.9 and not is not recurring expenditure as it comes from parallel programmes and initiatives. USD 200k however refers to recurring expenditure (staff time support). Accordingly, neither Table C which classifies parts of this co-financing as grant/investment mobilized and part as in-kind/recurrent expenditures was amended nor a new co-financing letter was sought.

(8) Given that based on the above answers to points 1 to 7, no real change were made, no update to the description of how any investment mobilized was identified, ensuring that each co-financier providing investment mobilized is specifically named in this section was enacted.

Agency Response ?06 April 2023

Points (4) and (7) are now duly addressed in the revised CEO ER document in the road map and on the portal.

Agency Response ? 14 April 2023

(1) As per GEF Sec.'s request and in conversation with the IW Programme Manager, a letter co-signed by the IA and EA has been uploaded in the road map.

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 17th of February 2023

(thenshaw): 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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly. Please address the following:

(1) Please detail the role of the regional coordinator and technical expert in the PPG and explain why there is \$40,000 budgeted and committed, yet there is no amount spent to date for this line item.

(2) The Annex C table demonstrates that no PPG funds were utilized to prepare this project. Please explain why.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) Note that the PPG regional coordinator has been in charge of coordination of project partners in Chile including co-finance agreements (i.e. specific to component 3) as well as consulting on all relevant project documents while the technical expert was in charge of overseeing all global project components (specifically, 1, 3, 4, 5) and global scale co-financing and partner consultations. The PPG resources reached the UKCEH late hence by the time of submission such resources were not yet reported as spent.

(2) Just like with a one-step MSP, PPG resources will be used retroactively for PPG costs incurred by the UKCEH in coordinating the PPG.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address following:

(1) The description of any changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF section does not describe the changes to the Core Indicator targets, which are substantial in some cases and new in other cases. Please explain each PIF deviation under the explanation on targets sub-heading under the Core Indicator table.

(2) Indicator 7.1 captures the commitment of countries to cooperatively manage a shared water system. Because this project does not involve such commitment between Chile and Peru to cooperatively manage the Humboldt Current LME, the 1 shared ecosystem under new or improved cooperative management target is not correct. Please remove this target from the Core Indicator Table and Annex A Results Framework.

(3) The Indicator 11 targets for female and male beneficiaries are reversed in the Annex A Results Framework. Please revise accordingly.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

1) The description of changes to the core indicator targets in the alignment section has been adjusted to explain each PIF deviation under the Core Indicator table.

(2) Indicator 7.1 does not seem to capture the commitment of countries to cooperatively manage a shared water system but rather speaks to the effect of the TDA/SAP and was not checked in (see below screenshot from the portal). The reference to the Humboldt current is in the aggregated section over which we have no control. There is indeed no pencil to edit. The portal automatically picked up the LME from our entries in 7.4, and 7.3 which are calling for inserting a shared water ecosystem. The project indeed does contribute to the Humboldt Current LME improved ecosystem health and management. Consequently, nothing was amended.

Indicator 7 Shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management



	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Shared water Ecosystem	Humbolt Current	Humbolt Current		
Count	1	1	0	0

Indicator 7.1 Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

[+ Add New](#)

3) The indicator 11 targets for female and male beneficiaries were adjusted in the portal.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): 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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

- (1) For Activity 2.3.3 please elaborate on the field visits to showcase exemplars of effective sustainable phosphorous management in established programs. Who will attend these field visits and will there be a strategy to scale the knowledge gained from such visits?
- (2) For Activity 2.3.4, it is noted that many communities of practice fade quickly/do not build traction. Please point to specific CoPs that have worked/sustained and any lessons learned to ensure the CoP flourishes beyond the two-year project?

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 230 March 2023

(1) For Activity 2.3.3, the field visits to showcase exemplars of effective sustainable phosphorous management in established programs were further explained including who will attend these field visits and what the strategy to scale the knowledge gained from such visits will be.

The field visits will build on an established international community of practice convened by the World Water Quality Alliance during PPG. This community of practice currently consists of representation from 63 countries covering over 180 lake restoration case studies. We have, through a Global Survey of Lake Practitioners, confirmed that the primary issue facing these practitioners is sustainable phosphorus management, specifically requiring reduction in phosphorus pollution to meet established lake management targets. In addition to this community the project will engage with countries reporting to SDG 6.3.2 through our contact in the leadership team of this indicator. Selection of exemplar cases will be conducted in partnership with the WWQA and SDG 6.3.2. Currently, we have offers to host a field trip from established exemplar teams, including Loch Leven (UK), Lahti Lake (Finland), and Lake Villarrica (Chile). Attendees will be invited and selected from across the international community of practice, but will also include representatives from international bodies (e.g. ILEC, WWQA, UNEA 5/4 Resolution Implementation Unit). Knowledge exchange material will be recorded on each visit and made publicly available along with reports on key topics discussed and key messages for policy makers, the international practitioner community and

the public. In this way, we will utilise our global reach to ensure that lessons learned are scaled-up across all sectors.

(2) For Activity 2.3.4, additional information on specific CoPs that have worked/sustained and any lessons learned to ensure the CoP flourishes beyond the two-year project were added.

We have ensured that our actions will be sustainable through partnership with established long-term actors. These include the World Water Quality Alliance (at least to 2030) and the UN SDG 6 teams. These teams are currently working together through association with the UNEA 5/4 Resolution on Sustainable Lake Management which calls for enhanced international collaboration and knowledge exchange on this topic. As an early output following discussions during PPG the project team in collaboration with WWQA and SDG6 have produced a White Paper on Sustainable Lake Management which sets out a long-term plan for support of the Global Community of Practice, recognising the need for a new Global Coalition on Lakes, including the establishment of a Green Finance Initiative. This is designed to directly address the concern raised in the reviewer's comment, which is highly relevant, and should support future GEF projects in this arena.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) The figures for female and male beneficiaries described in this section are reversed in the Core Indicator table. Please revise accordingly.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

1) The figures for female and male beneficiaries described in this section were reversed in the Core Indicator table in the portal.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) Please see comment above re: sustainability of community of practice and examples/experiences and lessons learned to ensure it flourishes after the project ends.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ?30 March 2023

(1) As mentioned above sustainability of community of practice and examples/experiences and lessons learned to ensure it flourishes after the project ends were added in.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes. The high resolution version of the map is annexed.

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

N/A

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes. Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan annexed.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) While it is appreciated that the Gender Action Plan provided specifics on how gender equality will be considered in each of the project's components and outputs, please reflect gender perspectives in the section on Project Description/Project Components, in line with good gender mainstreaming practice.

(2) On the project indicators relating to percentage of women in peer reference group? for example, in Outputs 1.1;2.1;2.3 (as specified in section on Gender) 20% is very low. Please increase to minimum 30% women and preferably, higher.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) Although we do have an appendix on gender including a gender action plan and have pasted the same into the portal in the gender section, as to address the request the gender perspectives have now also been added in the section on Project Description/Project Components. We are however not exactly sure why the same information has to be pasted in three different places.

(2) As per the request, the project indicators related to percentage of women in peer reference group in Outputs 1.1;2.1;2.3 (as specified in section on Gender) have been increased to 30% .

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) The risk matrix notes that a mitigation measure against a lack of interest of the private sector in activities is to develop a private sector engagement strategy. Please note in this section that such a strategy will be developed and the means to develop the strategy.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) The risk matrix notes that a mitigation measure against a lack of interest of the private sector in activities is to develop a private sector engagement strategy. Note that such a strategy will be developed as follows

We will work with established science-policy-industry communication platforms (e.g. Sustainable Phosphorus Alliance and European Sustainable Phosphorus Platform) to develop an engagement strategy for the private sector. This is likely to include regular communications through established networks as listed in the baseline section. We have established connections with relevant international bodies including the fertiliser (i.e. Fertiliser Europe, IFA), waste water (i.e. Veolia, International Water Association), and aquaculture sectors (i.e. FAO). Under Component 1, the project will work to bring these parties together to establish and implement a communication strategy as a key output. This approach is acknowledged in Appendix 10, and in reference to planned interactions with specific networks in the Baseline Section of the CEO DOC describing engagement with established National and International Innovation Networks in delivery of the uP-Cycle Innovations Hub (e.g. P 33).

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes.

Reviewer note: A Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis is present.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes, but please include the following:

(1) Please elaborate on any other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area (non-GEF) that the project may coordinate with.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

Component 3 with a focus on Chile will deliver evidence on the present-day nutrient pollution of lakes and will build on existing bilateral initiative on this topic between the governments of Chile and Japan, as listed in the co-finance. We'd like to draw attention as well to a project included in the co-financing provided by the Universidad de la Frontera assessing nutrient pollution and algal blooms in freshwater and coastal ecosystems in Chile. At the global scale, we will engage in the initiatives emerging from the recent UNEA 5/4 Resolution on ?Sustainable Lake Management? connecting the Governments of Indonesia, Chile and other interested parties. The inclusion of transboundary lakes in component 2 will allow further non-GEF bilateral/multilateral initiatives as indicated under component 2 description listed in the CEO-Doc (P51). In addition, non GEF initiatives have been added into table 6 section 6.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): 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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

(1) Please provide in the CEO Document the table with set of KM deliverables/communication activities and timeline for implementation. This table is included in Annex 10.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed

5th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Please include the budget (separate column) for each KM deliverable in the table in the portal.

9th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ?30 March 2023

This was done accordingly in the CEO in section 3.

Agency Response ?06 April 2023

Indicative budget was added in a separate column for each KM deliverable in the table in the portal and revised CEO ER document in the road map.

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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): 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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): 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

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly, please address the following:

- (1) Please include the Annex A Project Results Framework in the CEO Document itself. To preserve format, please screenshot and paste.
- (2) In the Project Budget, \$80,000 is allocated to travel for project personnel across three technical components. Please explain here in the review sheet what this travel will be for.
- (3) In the Project Budget, 7 line items are grants. Please explain why these funds are characterized as grants. Please elaborate for each line.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

- (1) GEF IT to support upload of Annex A Results Framework
- (2) Addressed
- (3) Addressed

9th of April 2023 (thenshaw): IT assisted with upload. Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

1. Despite the several attempts and many tricks, just like at first submission, it proved impossible to paste the logframe into the portal section Annex A. It was agreed with the GEF Sec Program Manager that the Logframe would be submitted separately for his follow up with ICT at WB.

2. Component 1: Travel is requested at \$30k for in person attendance at workshops by global experts in lake management, sustainable nutrient management, and data visualisation with the global industry working group to develop the global dashboard, construct future scenarios, and produce outputs and content for inclusion in the White Paper. It is envisaged that in-person meetings will be key for relationship building across sectors in the delivery for Component 1.

Component 2: Travel is requested (i.e. \$20k) to support expert exchanges to Chile to deliver and support on the ground capacity development activities.

Component 4: Travel is requested for attendance at the IW conferences (\$10k) and for attendance in dissemination activities at high level events (i.e. \$20k for attendance at, e.g. UNEA meetings, presentations at academic and industry focussed conferences, representation at Stockholm World Water Week Special Sessions).

3. Following the UNEP budget template nomenclature, this is how sub-contracts to partners upon selection are being granted hence reported in our budget table.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly,

(1) Please address Core Indicator 11 target reversal, as noted above.

(2) The Results Framework Table must be pasted in Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Portal. Please screenshot and paste the Table or contact ITS assistance for support.

5th of April 2023 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) GEF IT will support with the upload of Annex A to the Portal.

9th of April 2023 (thenshaw): IT assisted with upload. Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) Core Indicator 11 target reversal has been done as noted above.

(2) The Results Framework Table could not be pasted in Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Portal as currently mentioned. ICT assistance will be requested.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request --

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): Partly. Please address the following:

(1) Please detail the role of the regional coordinator and technical expert in the PPG and explain why there is 40,000 budgeted and committed to this consultancy, yet there is no amount spent to date.

4th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 30 March 2023

(1) This was answered as stated above.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): 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

N/A

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 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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23rd of February 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

5th of April 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

9th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Under review

14th of April 2023 (thenshaw): No, please address above comment and resubmit. Thank you.

17th of April 2023 (thenshaw): Yes

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations