

Promoting Resource Efficiency and Circularity to Reduce Plastic Pollution for Asia and the Pacific

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10628

Countries

Regional (Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam)

Project Name

Promoting Resource Efficiency and Circularity to Reduce Plastic Pollution for Asia and the Pacific

Agencies

ADB

Date received by PM

5/14/2021

Review completed by PM

9/7/2021

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

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
(PPO Sept 7, 2021). No. Please address the following remaining points:

Regarding the comments provided on August 3rd, some have not been addressed:

4- On core indicators (comment provided by Olha): not addressed. The issue that Cyril raised in his second sentence (?Please cross-reference the Core Indicators in Table B and in the Annex A Results Framework for consistency and to appropriately reflect the logic of interventions. This cross-reference should include the targets and appropriate means to monitor results achievement in Annex A.?). The Targets that need to be cross-referenced can be found in Core Indicator table (targets are set for GEF core indicators 5, 6, 10 and 11) ? please cross-reference them in Annex A ?Project Results Framework?.

6- On budget:

- Sub-contract with the executing partner/entity for \$200,000: not addressed. Per the explanation provided by the Agency in the Review Sheet, ?this is for UN-COBSEA which will provide dual services of regional execution and

delivery of knowledge and technical services under Component 3. As such we have shifted a representative percentage of the proposed costs of 'execution' to PMC; and retained the balance under Component 3 as subcontractor?.

Hence, the current budget shows that UN-COBSEA will execute the knowledge management and technical services for \$140,000 while still \$60,000 from PMC will be paid to this Agency as 'costs of execution'. This has to be removed as the GEF doesn't cover the costs of execution: if needed, this has to be covered by the co-financing portion of the PMC.

- Clarification in Portal what the budget line 'Contractual services'?

Company? entails: not addressed. There was not possible to find out any explanation in Portal or in the Review Sheet. If we missed, kindly let us know where to find the explanation.

(PPO, Aug 18, 2021). Please address the following points:

1- As discussed by email, Myanmar needs to be removed from the text. For consistency, please note that in Portal there are 13 parts where Myanmar has also to be removed? same applies to the Project Document (3 mentions).

2- In Table A Focal Area Outcomes are missing? please amend.

3- On co-financing: While Portal entry indicates \$69M loan and \$3.7M grant (both by ADB), the description of IW section lists other sources with significant amount that have not been entered in Portal. Please clarify.

4- On Core Indicators: Please cross-reference the Core Indicators in Table B and in the Annex A Results Framework for consistency and to appropriately reflect the logic of interventions. This cross-reference should include the targets and appropriate means to monitor results achievement in Annex A.

5- The budgeted M&E Plan is missing in Portal, it is only attached to the documents? tab? please include it in Portal.

6- On budget:

- Table in Portal goes beyond the margin and the figures won't fit the boxes, making difficult to understand the values. Please amend (hint: perhaps the Agency can limit the columns to Components instead of Outcomes, so the table will be slimmer and would fit within the margins)

- There is a sub-contract with the executing partner/entity for \$200,000. GEF funds cannot be utilized to cover the administrative cost of the executing

partner/entity, only to cover the activities associated with the project's execution (which should be charged to PMC). Please remove this charge and re-distribute.

- Please clarify in Portal what the budget line 'Contractual services - Company' entails (this is neither explained in the version attached in the Document's tab).

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

ADB Response to PPO Comments 08 September 2021

4. We have revised the Table B to include core indicator relevance for each of the 3 Outcomes. The core indicator values have been distributed on a 20%, 50% and 30% basis across the 3 Outcome / Components given the estimated weights of the contribution of these actions towards the Core Indicators. Similarly these Core Indicator targets have been entered into the Annex A Design and Monitoring Framework (DMF) which serves as 'project results framework'. We have included 'Means of Monitoring / Verification' in the DMF as well.

6. On budget: Based on our call with PPO Senior Operations Coordinator and the responsible Project Officer (L. Karrer), we have made the following adjustments: i) the \$ 60,000 has been shifted to a 'staff' position under PMC. The role will be for an individual to serve as Regional Coordinator, ii) retained the \$ 140,000 for 'sub-contract to organization'. This will be a contract issued to UN-COBSEA to deliver knowledge management / learning services under Outcome / Component 3. The 21-09-08 Revised TORs in Annex L can be cross-referenced for these.

Further, the 'Contractual services - company/NGO/consortium' section has been explained in the budget. This will be for delivery of Outcome / Components 1 and 2 under the project. The TORs for the firm / NGO / consortium are provided in 21-09-08 Revised Annex L.

For both of the above there are references highlight in the narrative of the CER, with more detail in the section on Institutional Arrangements and Coordination.

ADB Response to PPO 29 August 2021

1. References to "Myanmar" have been removed. Some have been retained as this is part of the required presentation to GEF, for example the table on differences between PIF and CER. Myanmar has been removed from the Portal country list as approved by the GEF project officer (L. Karrer) and executed by the ITS. The removals are marked by yellow highlight.

2. Table A amended.
3. An explanation is provided in the CER for clarity. The long list of project are those which are "Associated". Among these 2 are being used officially as co-finance.
4. Table B and Annex A have been reviewed and synchronized / aligned as suggested.
5. The budgeted M&E plan has been embedded in the Portal
6. The budget format has been adjusted to include only Component level costs. On the \$ 200 K subcontract. Please be advised that this is for UN-COBSEA which will provide dual services of regional execution and delivery of knowledge and technical services under Component 3. As such we have shifted a representative percentage of the proposed costs of 'execution' to PMC; and retained the balance under Component 3 as subcontractor.

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

(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

Note that the Cirebon discussion of the Circular Business Hub and Test Facility still notes that is is focused on recycling. This issue is relevant to the Plastik Sulit Indonesia project. As the response below notes, the Indonesia project is focused on upstream solutions and, therefore, the Hub should too.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The CER indicates the project will occur in Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, and Viet Nam. There are city action plans (output 1.1) in Manila City, Philippines, Tan An, Viet Nam, and Cirebon, Indonesia. There are policy plans for (output 1.2) for Viet Nam and Thailand. And there are pilots (output 2.2) planned for Cirebon, Indonesia and Tan An, Viet Nam. Please clarify what activities will occur in Myanmar.

Please clarify the intent of Outcome 1 related to city action plans. Table B says 'drafted?' and the text under the Theory of Change says 'supported?' and then the text under Output 1.1 says 'developed and implementation supported?'.

There continues to be an emphasis on downstream measures. Often there is mention of circular economy as well as SWM. SWM is one aspect of CE. IF SWM is called out, then so too should the other aspects ? alt materials, reuse? For example, under Output 3

The Bankable investments workshop notes CE, alternative materials and SWM but not the other aspects.

Output 1.1 - The city action plans focus heavily on waste collection and management and do not reflect a circular economy approach, which also encompasses alternative materials, reuse, refill systems and repairs and resale services. Manila City and Tan An, for example, both discuss examining existing SWM systems, but not existing reuse or refill systems. Investments in infrastructure need to include considering not only recycling facilities, but also commercial sanitation for washing reusable durable bottles, cups, plates, utensils, etc that are otherwise single-use disposables as well as for resale and repair services. The workshops need to include not only recycling but also reuse/repair/resale stakeholders. Discussion of analyzing perceptions needs to consider not only perceptions of waste, but also perceptions of solutions such as reuse, repair, resale, etc and how to overcome the misperception that plastic disposables are 'safer' and 'cleaner' than reusables.

Of greatest concern, all 8 of the items listed for the Cirebon city action plan are focused on recycling. None of the upstream options are even mentioned. And the discussion of Cirebon mentions a Circular Business Hub and Test Facility for plastic recycling activities through the GEF project, but this hub is intended to foster all circular innovations not only related to recycling.

There is mention of biodegradable materials as alternatives to plastics. 'Biodegradable' does not have a set standard and often requires extreme conditions such as high temperatures and does not degrade in landfills or in the marine environment. 'Compostable' in contrast is recognized to mean will degrade in a composting facility, but requires actually being sent to a compost facility. In the Ghana project standards are identified for biodegradable and composting standards, which may be useful to consider.

Output 1.2 focuses on recycling and waste management with little mention to how policies to promote upstream actions will be pursued.

Output 1.2 mentions Viet Nam and Thailand. What about the other countries?

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2021

1. The CER now indicates that the project will no longer include Myanmar. Depending on the development of the political situation in Myanmar, the country could in future benefit from the project's regional workshops and knowledge sharing. Please refer - <https://www.adb.org/news/adb-statement-new-developments-myanmar>.

2. Outcome 1, Output 1.1. edited for clarity in the CER

3. We have differentiated between CE and SWM throughout the proposal to address the misconception that SWM and Recycling = CE. With this we wanted to show that we go beyond SWM and work upstream. The aspects mentioned such as alternative product and packaging systems, material minimization (reduce) and reuse are what we consider to be CE, which is why these were not singled out separately. This has been edited for clarity in the CEO Endorsement document

Further, it is our view that switching to alternative materials does not always constitute circular economy. Switching from plastics to alternative materials does not lead to the necessary systemic shift of minimizing the virgin resource use, as alternative materials are mostly still used for single use short lived products and packaging in a linear economy and can also have higher life-cycle costs. We are happy to discuss this further.

4. On Output 1.1. City action plans: The examining of SWM systems is done in order to identify priority product groups to target for upstream work on circular economy alternatives and identifying the opportunities and highest circular business potentials for alternatives to single-use and other difficult plastics.

We have not included an analysis examining existing reuse and refill systems as they are not in widespread use in Indonesia currently. However, if these exist in the cities we work with, we will identify these early on and involve them in the engagement forums as well.

We agree that the city action plan and financing roadmap for Cirebon is focused on SWM and recycling. The separate FSP Plastik Suli in Indonesia is heavily focused on upstream circular activities and will include the type of CE projects referenced in the Secretariat comments. However, the MSP is city oriented and carefully aligned with the NPAP recommendations and the capacity building needed at the city government level to support the larger project on CE.

The financing roadmap in the MSP is on SWM only and not upstream, as we will include financing needs and investments in reuse and refill systems and the necessary sanitary investments in the "Plastic Suli" Output 1.3 Financing Roadmap that will include EPR and be industry oriented. (This is forthcoming under the stand alone GEF project in Indonesia).

5. Cirebon is host to both the Regional MSP and the proposed Plastik Suli FSP. We have deliberately angled the MSP project activities to provide both maximum support for the city and to be a foundation for the FSP which is heavily focused on the upstream activities and will benefit from a more in depth understanding of current plastic flows in the Cirebon economy. The Circular Business Hub and Test Facility are focal points of the FSP.

6. On biodegradable vs compostable: These distinctions are appreciated and will be included in the project implementation. 'Biodegradable plastic' in the MSP CER is used as an umbrella term that also includes compostable plastics. To avoid misunderstanding, we have also made references to 'compostable' where relevant.

Biodegradable and compostable plastics will be covered under the Forum for Circular Plastics Packaging as these materials are often perceived and promoted as alternatives to fossil plastics that can reduce ocean plastic pollution.

The project component aims to collect and provide information as to which degree biobased, compostable and biodegradable should be recommended as alternatives and what the limitations might be. This information will feed into the action plan process lead by the countries

7. Output 1.2 for Viet Nam includes upstream solutions as the design guide for Circular Plastics. It will include recommendations on plastic waste preventive systems based on reuse measures.

Output 1.2 for Thailand, per request from the Government relates to Thailand's National Waste and Plastic Waste Management Law. The scope request includes specific policy support related to recycling as well as some plastic waste studies and literature reviews. However, the CER also includes development of policy proposals for instruments and measures to reduce single-use plastic bags from fresh markets and grocery stores, as an upstream initiative. Further, it is our understanding that the requests could also include more upstream solutions. During implementation, this will be discussed further with the Government of Thailand, in order to explore and encourage options for further upstream solutions.

8. This is duly noted. The CER has been edited for clarity. While this output is focused on policy support for Viet Nam and Thailand, this is with a view to generate lessons that will be documented and shared with other countries to benefit from the experience. Two other factors also bear mention: I) limited budgetary resources and ii) expressed demand from Government leadership in the project countries.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

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

(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

As noted in the PIF review, government co-financing at least in-kind is expected and private sector support was also discussed. Please pursue this option or provide an explanation as to why the governments are not providing resources to support this project, which suggests a lack of commitment. Please also explain the lack of support from the private sector.

The co-financing loan documentation indicates \$50M co-financing; whereas the CER indicates \$69,000 in loan. Please clarify or correct. Please also ensure the letter confirming the grant amount of \$3.7M is included.

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2021

Government ?in kind? co-financing commitments have now been added to Table C and letters from government agencies submitted.

During the PPG period the estimated loan co-financing was \$50 million USD as project preparations were ongoing. The actual loan has now been approved at \$69 million USD.

Kindly refer to the annexed ADB TA on ?Promoting Action on Plastic Pollution from Source to Sea in Asia and the Pacific? which confirms the co-financing grant of \$ 3.7 million from the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) and Republic of Korea e-Asia Knowledge Partnership Fund (EAKPF) respectively. This RETA will also serve as the ?Internal Agency Document? for processing the GEF funds once endorsed.

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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The photos of buildings and maps are included twice.

Agency Response
ADB Response 22 July 2021

We regret that this is a Portal upload error on our part. This has been corrected.

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
NA

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
(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

There have been extensive consultations with global initiatives, such as GPAP, WWF Plastic Smart Cities, UNEP, World Bank and others. However, it seems the NGOs in the countries have not been consulted.

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2021

NGOs have been widely consulted in the development of the project, with a view to continued engagement through implementation of various components of the project. The records of their engagement have been combined with the other engagements for clarity in the CEO Endorsement document (see Section 2. Stakeholders) and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

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

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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

(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The private sector does not seem to have been engaged. There is mention of Coca-Cola but it is unclear what role they would play in the project and they have not been consulted. Here is an opportunity to discuss with them a pilot reusable bottle system. At the city level also the private sector associations such as chambers of commerce have not been engaged. Only in Indonesia it seems there have been some consultations with businesses.

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2021

This section of the CER has been revised / updated.

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

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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

(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The regional EA needs to be identified.

The institutional arrangements indicate that ADB will serve as executing agency, which is not accepted under GEF policy. An entity other than the ADB has to execute the project, which includes hosting the PCU. The regional organization (TBD) would seem

the likely choice. Currently the regional executing entity is written as only 'supporting' coordination, which suggests little authority.

The CoFos have been removed. These entities were going to play an important role to engage stakeholders. Please explain how these responsibilities will be undertaken by other entities.

Agency Response

ADB Response 22 July 2021

ADB appreciates GEF Secretariat patience as we have worked through the challenges of identifying an appropriate regional executing entity. As per our prior communications with GEF Secretariat, we have proposed UN COBSEA for this role, and concurrence has now been received from Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam.

The institutional arrangements have been discussed with GEF Secretariat through email communications. This has been clarified in the appropriate section of the CER.

The National Executing Entity for each country, COBSEA and ADB, comprise the Project Steering Committee. The Project Steering Committee will provide overarching guidance and direction for the implementation of the project.

COBSEA, as the proposed Regional Executing Entity and member of the Project Steering Committee, will (i) provide leadership and technical expertise on regional knowledge activities and ensure integration with regional action plans and other regional programs and initiatives; (ii) implement the project's regional activities, in line with the work plan, timeline, budget, organizational and flow chart; (iii) regularly coordinate and collaborate with the Implementation Firm (NGO or Consortium), and lead on building and managing relationships with regional partners and stakeholders, (iv) provide early inputs and review to the Implementation Firm's (or Consortium or NGO) key knowledge and deliverables in-country and regionally to ensure alignment with regional plans and priorities, current knowledge and best practice, and knowledge-transfer across country activities.

Regarding the CoFos: The term 'Collaborative Forum' has been removed to avoid confusion with Indonesia 'Plastik Sulit' activities however the principles, approaches and activities remain in place for effective knowledge management, multi-stakeholder and inclusive engagement and local ownership. These approaches will be emphasized and required in COBSEA (tbc as Regional Executing Entity) and Implementation Firm/Consortium/NGO terms of reference.

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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, July 27, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, June 7, 2021). No.

The Partner knowledge sharing webinar series is noted twice. Also, it mentions waste trade but not other circular strategies (alt materials, refill, reuse, resale, repair, etc).

Agency Response
ADB Response 22 July 2021

Edited for clarity in the CER.

Deleted additional ?partner knowledge sharing webinar series? and added ?circular plastics economy best practices and business models.?

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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). 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
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 7, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/27/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	9/1/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

(Karrer, Aug 18, 2021). See points above from PPO.