



# Funafuti Water and Sanitation Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10742

**Countries**

Tuvalu

**Project Name**

Funafuti Water and Sanitation Project

**Agencies**

ADB

**Date received by PM**

7/29/2022

**Review completed by PM**

9/26/2022

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**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

9/30/2022: Cleared.

Update, GEF Sec, 9/29/2022:

Correction is requested. In the Project Information section, the duration is stated as 60 months, yet as per the expected implementation start and end dates, the duration appears to be 72 months. Please make these consistent.

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/8/2022:

Minor edit requested: In the left-most column of Table B, please change the project component number to "2" (it currently shows as "2.1").

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thanks

#### Agency Response

**ADB UPDATE 30 Sep 2022**

The duration should be 72 months. However we cannot change the Portal duration on our own, and will require ITS support with this. Sorry for this oversight.

ADB Response 21 Sep 22

Done.

**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

GEF Sec, 9/8/22:

Cleared. Thank you for this explanation. We welcome the opportunity to deliver broader adaptation impact than originally envisaged.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Thank you for further elaboration on Table B.

1. It is noted that the articulation of project objective has changed with addition of "drinking water supply", which was not included in its original Child project objective. While we welcome such inclusion given the direct link of the adverse impact of climate change on water supply and its network, kindly provide update on how this has evolved. With inclusion of "Drinking water supply" the scope of the project has become much larger than initial target of wastewater infrastructure.
2. For other comments in Table B, please refer to question 3, Part II

Agency Response

ADB Response 01 September 2022

The original child project was based on a preliminary scoping - as Tuvalu was integrated somewhat late into the regional program and at that time ADB had no directly related ongoing activities. Subsequently, several scoping and planning and consultation exercises led to a re-scoping of the project, as directed by government. The project now includes covers water supply and sanitation sub-sectors. The principal reasons for this are:

- The strategic linking of the two sub-sectors: i.e. reaching objectives in either of the two sub-sectors contributes in a small way to progress in the other sub-sector;
- The institutional linkages: i.e. the same government agencies are responsible for regulating/implementation of both sub-sectors, and many laws/regulations pertain to both sub-sectors. Hence, if designed carefully, many activities and inputs will contribute to both sub-sectors;

- The physical linkages ? the actual civil works required to install infrastructure for both sub-sectors are closely related and efficiencies can be made by addressing both sub-sectors simultaneously.

It is recognised that this leads to an increase in scope, potentially significant. To address this, and to avoid ?overreach? by the project: (i) a thorough and strategic approach to both sub-sectors has been developed, with inputs and activities set across three realistic time phases ? as set out in the related master plans (in Appendices). This project realistically addresses phase 1 of both sub-sector master plans; (ii) additional co-financing is being sought ? although the impacts of the Covid pandemic have made this more challenging, the government and ADB remain confident that co-financing will be mobilized over the medium term.

Modifications to CEOR: This has been incorporated into the sub-section ?Describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF.?

**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 GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes.

Thanks

Agency Response  
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 GEF Sec, 9/15/22:  
Cleared.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes, the financing presented in the Table D is adequate. However, on the cost-effectiveness, please refer to comments under question 3, Part II on the suggested intervention for cost effectiveness and climate resilience of the infrastructure.

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 9/30/2022: Addressed by ITS.

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:  
Cleared. This needs to be addressed by GEF Sec ITS.

GEF Sec, 9/8/2022:  
Please enter "false" above Table F in the Project Information section, as PPG has not been requested for this project.

Agency Response  
ADB Response 23 Sep 22

As per email exchange with ITS, this will be resolved at the 'back end'.

**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

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared. Agency has specified that 50% needs to be attributed to Other\Sanitation services.

GEF Sec, 9/8/2022:

Adjustment is requested.

- 1) In meta-indicators section, please tick the checkbox (i.e., mark as "true") for whether the project is located in a fragile state. Tuvalu is included on the World Bank's FY23 list of Fragile situations, due to Institutional and Social fragility.
- 2) In the sectors list, "Other" constitutes 50%. Could you please specify in the text box for that section what Other includes? Thank you.
- 3) Core Indicator 1, Output 1.1.1: It seems that several public infrastructures (storage reservoirs, desalination plant) will be made climate-resilient; would it be possible to factor these in for Core Indicator 1, under "public buildings", or "Other", where you may enter information manually?

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thanks

## Agency Response

ADB Response 22 September 2022

- 1) Done
- 2) The other sector to be mentioned is sanitation services. I.e., approximately 50% of the project focusses on waste water treatment and sanitation. This is noted in the Annex F excel sheet. We refer to the email exchange with ITS about the inability to fill in narrative in the ?Other? box on the Portal.
- 3) The table has been updated with required information.

## 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

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Cleared, thank you.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Thanks for describing climate hazards and vulnerability of the water and sanitation infrastructure to such climate hazards.

1. With regard to climate rationale for sanitation system, kindly describe how the climate hazards (increased rainfall, sea level rise and increased storm surge) are affecting the on-site septic system. While such hazards can clearly impact transportation and disposal of sewage, pathway for impact on septic system need to clearer.
2. Also, please clarify the term "water sanitation".

## Agency Response

ADB Response 01 September 2022

1. The on-site septic system is currently the most important contributor to waste water treatment. It consists mostly of wastewater storage in septic tanks, with some (little) localised treatment/natural decomposition, and then pumping to a truck and transport to waste disposal site.

1. The three parameters of increased rainfall, sea level rise and storm surge act independently but mostly in combination on this system. Each parameter is increasingly causing damage to septic tanks. Each is increasingly leading to un-controlled flushing of waste water out of tanks into public areas. Further, increased saline infiltration into tanks can slow or stop the natural decomposition of wastewater, thereby rendering the process less efficient. These impacts are significant.

Modifications to CEOR: This has been elaborated in the subsection 'sanitation' under the subsection 'climate and climate change challenges to water supply and sanitation in Funafuti' (pages 21-22 of word version).

2. This is typed error. This should read 'waste water' or simply 'sanitation' (this latter is the terms used in the Master Plan in Appendix 1).

Modifications to CEOR: This has been corrected at the appropriate points - in line with the Master Plan.

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Baseline scenario, associated projects and barriers are well described. Thank you.

## 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

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared. Thank you for the detailed explanation and additional relevant information provided in the agency response.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Further information is requested. Building on GEF Sec comment #5 provided on 8/4/22, however: household constraints in access to potable water are a major aspect of vulnerability. May we suggest that household RWH be included in the phased plan? We realize the O&M costs are potentially high. However, ignoring this important contributor to climate resilience among vulnerable households seems a significant gap. Would it be possible to train households on how to undertake O&M for their tanks, or would capital-intensive equipment provisioning be necessary?

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Thank you for further elaboration of Outputs and its linkages with the draft sanitation and water supply master plans. However, please provide the following clarification:

1. Under Output 1.1: Please provide further information on the indicative ways of improving WSS sector governance, and how the allocated fund will be utilized.
2. Under Output 1.4: Please provide brief description of key actions that will be carried out as a pilot water tariff reform.
3. We note that \$75.5 K is being allocated for output 1. It would be useful to learn how the fund will be spend across various sub outputs.
4. Output 2: As mentioned under the Part 1, Table B comments (Question 2, Part I), we see this as new item since the approval of PFD. We understand the need for drinking water supply, but please provide justification on inclusion
5. Also under Output 2: We understand that Installation/refurbishment of RO system will improve water security. However, it is suggested (only a suggestion), to focus on



further scaling up RWH and catchment system more predominantly, in addition to RO system. We are offering this suggestions, as it might require less O&M, especially in relation to technology, energy and technical skills required to maintain RO plants. This might improve the cost effectiveness.

6. Output 3: On the wastewater treatment plant, we understand the choice to drying bed as part of wastewater treatment technology. However, we suggest (only a suggestion) that you want to relook it this. This is because odor from the drying bed will create public nuisance. The drying bed will remain expose to climate hazard, unless we incorporate a drastic measures to climate proof it. Further, its performance depends on the weather condition. In addition, we understand that land is a precious resources, be it a govt, private or communal property. It is in this spirit that we suggest you to explore other sewage treatment technology that will be easier to climate proof, requires lesser space and robustly functions under any weather conditions. This suggestion is for your consideration, and we would fully understand, if alternative technological solutions are not appropriate for local context.

7. Overall, there is a reference to climate change mitigation. While we are happy to note that the project is generating climate mitigation co-benefits, the LDCF is mandated to support climate change adaptation actions in the LDCs

## Agency Response

ADB Response 22 September 2022

Many thanks for the comment.

The recent and ongoing consultations/data collection have led to some additional information, findings and proposed activities:

With regards to RWH, within the framework of the project, the following are already planned:

- ? A comprehensive household survey that survey household RWH status and capacity needs (and many other things). This is to commence in October. Future activities could be planned based on the findings.
- ? At remote (3 small islets) sites that cannot be connected to piped sources and cannot receive truck water deliveries, the project will assist households with RWH upgrading/rehabilitation and possibly provide some further storage tanks. The target is at least one 10,000L tank per household. (Site visits are planned soon, and the approach to O+M will be developed).

- ? In the project's institutional strengthening component, the project is to review previous efforts and identify possible strategies to motivate improved household level RWH O+M (as this is a known barrier ? see below).

However, the following should be noted:

- ? On Funafuti, there have been many previous awareness raising programs on household RWH, covering the importance of RWH, its maintenance, and how to maintain. This also includes recent efforts by PWD to encourage/promote household RWH. However, PWD has been disappointed with the results, particularly with regards to maintenance, and many household RWH systems are not performing well.
- ? Household RWH is considered a good strategy to lower consumer costs outside of dry periods. It is not considered a good strategy to improve water security during dry periods - as the storage capacity is insufficient and they can run dry.
- ? Planned social surveys will identify the poor/vulnerable on Funafuti. Subsequently, the project will help these target groups with (hopefully) a lifeline affordable tariff for basic water supply.
- ? The project is also supporting community rain water harvesting ? through the installation of village community water tanks and tap manifolds - for water distribution to local households.

Additional information has been incorporated into the document at the appropriate points (including Outputs 1 and 2 ).

ADB Response 01 September 2022

1. It is noted that no GEF funds are allocated to Output 1.1. This comment may refer to Output 1.1 and/or Output 1.2.

Appendix 4 gives an analysis of the key sector governance issues, it sets out options for reform and it recommends the short-term actions. It is noted that Appendix 4 is in draft form, and details of the actions to be implemented are subject to further validation. As set out in Appendix 4, the desired characteristics for the governance framework are: (i) Make service providers accountable; (ii) Set clear performance targets; (iii) Give incentives to meet performance targets, and; (iv) Give service providers autonomy to meet the performance targets.

Appendix 4, based on in-country consultations/considerations and drawing from international experience, recommends a phased approach of first strengthening some of the *basics* of utility operation and regulation before later moving on to *structural* reforms. Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 focus on these *basics*. Hence, the steps to be specifically supported (tentatively) through the project are through establishing performance contracts and performance agreements. This will notably be between the Ministry (MPWIELD) and Public Works Department (PWD), and in turn between PWD and Water Services Division (WSD).

It is also noted that Output 1.3 includes a comprehensive training program (details in Appendix 4), and this will also contribute to improved governance.

Modifications to CEOR: see modified description of Output 1.2 in the full text.

2. As noted in Appendix 4, current tariffs for both water and sanitation services are well below the costs. Further, it is considered probable that most customers in Funafuti could conceivably pay more for water and sanitation services without impacting affordability thresholds. Hence, in theory, there is room to increase tariffs without violating the affordability threshold. Yet, it is recognized that there are challenges, notably: (i) water tariffs may become unaffordable at some point; (ii) if households have to make one large water delivery payment there may be cashflow problems; (iii) potential social/political problems from a *rapid* increase of tariffs to cost recovery; and (iv) tariff increases have to be incremental and take more vulnerable groups into consideration.

At this point, consultations and analysis are ongoing in order to determine the optimal approach for increasing tariffs and cost recovery.

Modifications to CEOR: More information is provided in the description of Output 1.4 in the full text.

3. The total cost of Output 1 is \$265.5 K, with \$75.5 from GEF/LDCF. As described in section 1.A.5, whereas Outputs 2 and 3 have clear climate change adaptation components, Output 1 consists of the supporting and enabling environment activities required in order to ensure the water supply and sanitation, Output 1 is supporting and necessary for Outputs 2 and 3 to function effectively. Hence the climate change costs of Output 1 are determined by applying the overall ratio of climate costs from Outputs 2 and 3 combined to Output 1. Hence, the climate costs of Output 1 are \$178.25 K, of which LDCF is requested to cover only \$75.5 K (see table 6 for more details). ADB co-financing covers the other \$102.75 K of climate change costs.

Accordingly, under Output 1, it is not possible to clearly separate out the climate change inputs. LDCF contributes overall to the Output, as does the co-financing. Within this framework, at this stage, it is envisaged that the LDCF funds will cover the costs of an internationally experienced Water Supply and Sanitation Utility/Governance Specialist.

Modifications to CEOR: More information provided in section 1.A.5.

4. The original child project was based on a preliminary scoping - as Tuvalu was integrated somewhat belatedly to the regional program and ADB had no directly related ongoing activities. Subsequently, several scoping and planning and consultation exercises led to a re-scoping of the project, as directed by government. The project now includes covers water supply and sanitation sub-sectors.

Modifications to CEOR:

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared, thank you.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Please also discuss how the project outcomes will contribute to green recovery in the post-COVID context. We understand that the cumulative number of COVID cases in the country is low; however, have there been economic spillover effects of the pandemic that this project will be contributing to recovery from?

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 September 2022

Many thanks for the suggestion.

An assessment of Covid opportunities has been included at the end of Section 5 (Risks)

**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

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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  
GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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  
GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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  
GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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

9/30/2022:

Cleared.

Update, GEF Sec, 9/29/2022:

In the Gender section in the Portal entry, please respond to the questions on socio-economic benefits and gender-sensitive indicators (last two questions in section).

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

## Agency Response

**ADB UPDATE 30 Sept 2022**

YES - for ?generating socio-economic benefits for women?.

•This is true in general. Also, with the GAP some specific activities focussing on this may also take place. Also, some training/awareness raising will focus more on women.

?Does the project?s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators??

Yes -- In the DMF/results framework, the targets regarding women are not very strong, but they are real. Further the GAP also includes separate targets for women.

## 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

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

## 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

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Cleared, thank you.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Thank you for risk of climate change as mentioned in Appendix 1.

1. Please reflect on how the climate change is likely to affect the implementation of this project, and the proposed mitigation measures.

2. Also, please consider how to manage continuing risk of COVID-19 pandemic on this project, as it has affected preparation thus far.

#### Agency Response

ADB Response 01 September 2022

1. The project is designed as a response to climate change, hence, by design, ultimately, the project outputs should not be affected by the project.

However, climate change does create risks related to the project *implementation*. These risks, and the mitigation measures, have been incorporated into the risks section.

Modifications to CEOR: addition to table 7 on risks.

2. The COVID-19 related risks, and the mitigation measures, have been incorporated into the risks section.

Modifications to CEOR: addition to table 7 on risks.

#### 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

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

#### Agency Response

**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

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

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

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared, thank you.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

We suggest also considering developing "best practice" guides with examples of approaches that did and did not work regarding the provision/expansion/retrofitting of infrastructure to enhance climate resilience. These would be developed with the aim of in sharing across the region. Please also discuss whether there are existing lessons from similar efforts in other SIDS of the region from where best practice and insights can be obtained to guide the activities of the proposed project.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

Agency Response  
ADB Response 22 Sept 2022

Many thanks for the suggestion.

Additional information on both the points raised has been provided in section 8, (Knowledge management).

**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

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:



Please provide a breakdown for the budgeted M&E plan (a table may be included).

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 Sept 22

Done

See section 9 (Monitoring and Evaluation)

**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

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes. Thank you

Agency Response

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/6/22:

Cleared.

9/30/2022:

Adjustments are requested.

As this will be going for 4-week Council Review, we appreciate that all the annexes have been compiled into a single pdf document and uploaded to the Documents section.

However:

- 1) Given that it is over 400 pages long, please include page numbers in the Table of Contents that is presented on the first page.
- 2) Appendices 6, 7 and 8 state, on their cover pages, "draft expected before end July 2022". Please edit this text as appropriate.
- 3) Rather than stating "Not applicable" for annexes C and D, can you please state that

these are included in the GEF Portal CEO Endorsement Request? Thank you.

9/15/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**ADB Response 03 October 2022**

All three items have been addressed.

However given the huge difficulty in merging Word documents with PDF files with pagination and Table of Contents, we have split these into two separate, but quite readable packages.

22-10-30 FOR GEF COUNCIL Consolidated Annexes, and

22-10-03 FOR GEF COUNCIL Consolidated Appendices.

Hope this will suffice.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes.

Thank you

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Yes.

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 10/6/22:

Fully cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/23/2022:

Cleared. This needs to be addressed by GEF Sec ITS.

GEF Sec, 9/8/2022:

Please enter "false" above Table F in the Project Information section, as PPG has not been requested for this project.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Yes.

Thank you

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

GEF Sec, 10/6/22:

Yes.

GEF Sec, 9/30, 2022:

Not yet. Please see comment in the Annexes section.

GEF Sec, 9/29/2022:

Not yet. Please address the remaining review comments, thank you. Also, as this project will go for Council circulation, please place the annexes in a single uploaded document (e.g., stakeholder engagement plan, gender action plan, etc.).

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments, thank you.

GEFSEC, 8/4/2022: Not yet. Please address the above initial comments.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/8/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/15/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/23/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/30/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**