Transformation of Agrifood Systems through Smart Agriculture in Samoa

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11824
Countries
Samoa
Project Name
Transformation of Agrifood Systems through Smart Agriculture in Samoa
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
2/19/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Asha Bobb-Semple
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/23/2026
Cleared

3/12/2026

There seems to be an inconsistency on the Rio Markers. The project has been tagged as CCA2, LD1 and CCM1. As per the ToC and project description the right tagging seems to be LD2, CCM1 and CCA1. Please clarify and update accordingly.

Agency ResponseThe Rio Markers have been updated to LD2, CCM 1 and CCA1 accordingly.
2. Project Summary.
a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/23/2026

Cleared.

3/12/2026

a) Please very briefly outline the problem the project is seeking to address.

b) Not fully, see comment under a)

Agency Response

a) The project summary has been updated to include a brief outline of the problem that the project is seeking to address.

b) The project summary has been updated to ensure that it stays within the 250- word limit.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2026

Cleared.

4/23/2026

CI Targets have been included in the project description details. Please see additional comments under the question on indicators.

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes, however please include expected core indicator targets for each of the Components (where relevant).

c) Yes

d)

e) Yes

Agency Response

Response to 4/ 2026 comments:

Thank you for the review comments. Please see response to additional comments under the question on indicators.

Response to 3/ 2026 comments:

b) Expected core indicator targets relevant to CI 3, and 4 under Component 2 already exist under the Project Result Framework during the initial submission. It is now highlighted in yellow for easier identification. Additionally, the expected core indicators 3 and 4 for Component 2 are included and highlighted in the Project Description section. Project Core Indicator 6 (GHG emissions mitigation) and Project Core Indicator 11 (Beneficiary people) are attributed to different activities across the project's four components. This is why these two indicators are not reported by component.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) N/A

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

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

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

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

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

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

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

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

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

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

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

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/30/2026

Comment h) on stakeholder engagement has not been fully addressed. The GEF SEC comment provided did take into account the SEP, however revisions/updates still need to be made.

3/12/2026

a)- b) Yes.

c) Please see comments below:

i) Component 1 Activity 1.1.1.3 Development and endorsement of actionable, gender-responsive policy and regulatory recommendation- What is the plan to communicate the recommendations so that action is taken? Is there a cross-cutting national committee which will receive the recommendations?

ii) Output 1.2.3- It would be useful to explore a training of trainers (with a training institute or other academic institution to try to ensure consistency of capacity building.

iii) Biogas production. As per the CEO endorsement document, it seems the project will involve the production of biogas under activity 2.1.1. Please elaborate further on the expected installation of biogas as this was not initially included at PIF stage and confirm that only waste manure (and not crops) will be used. Also, will biogas equipment be installed in all pilot sites? Please explain. Finally, biogas production from waste manure carries several important risks related to safety, health, environment, and operations, such as methane leaks, explosion, toxic gases, potential water contamination from improperly managed digestate, etc. These risks should be properly incorporated in the risk section of the CEO endorsement document, and robust mitigation measures shall be identified.

d) No please include

e) Yes

f) Please see comments on the budget

g)No, please include.

h) Agency should better describe the different stakeholders? roles related to project objective, components and activities, including local farmers/communities, community-based organizations and women and youth groups and associations. Project approach to engage and consult these in project implementation should be further elaborated in the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP).

i)

j) Yes

k)Yes

l) Yes

Agency Response

Response to 4/ 2026 comments:

Further revision is made, describing the role of local farmers/communities, community-based organizations and women and youth groups and associations in the Project Description section relevant to the project objective, components and activities. These revisions are highlighted in yellow under the project description section.

Response to 3/ 2026 comments:

c i) The recommendations will be converted into cabinet briefing notes and policy briefs, endorsed by the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and presented to the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) to ensure formats that ministries can adopt. This has been updated in the description of Activity 1.1.1.3 and highlighted in yellow.

c ii) The training activities under this project output will be organized using the Training of Trainers (ToT) model, involving an academic partner (e.g., the University of the South Pacific, Samoa Campus), MAF Extension officials, and farmer groups. It will ensure capacity building persists beyond the project in Samoa and moves from ad hoc workshops to a co-owned, nationally resourced system. This has been updated in the description of Output 1.2.3 and highlighted in yellow.

c iii) Brief specification related to Biogas production is included under activity 2.1.1. The feedstock for the biogas will be poultry, pig, and cattle manure, as well as slaughterhouse waste. Four (4) biogas demonstration plants will be established in Vaisigano 2 ? Sataua of Savai'I, Palauli 2 ? Gataivai of Savai'I, Falealili 2 ? Salani of Upolu, and Sagaga 3 ? Aleisa of Upolu. This has been reflected in the description of activity 2.1.1 and highlighted in yellow. Biogas plant-related risks and associated mitigation measures are updated in the Environment and Social risk category of section B.3 Risk Management.

d) Narratives on the incremental/additional cost reasoning has been added in the text.

f) Please see below response on the budget section.

g) The project embedded adaptive management, flexibility, and learning systems across all activities. The project integrates continuous monitoring (climate risks, livestock productivity, biogas performance, gender outcomes) with feedback loops that inform periodic review of actions, training curricula, and operational practices. Activities such as biogas systems and CSA practices are designed to be modular and scalable, allowing adjustments to feedstock mix, technologies, and geographic targeting as conditions change. By embedding actions within national systems (ministries, extension services, academic institutions), the project ensures long-term institutional capacity to respond to emerging risks and opportunities. A knowledge platform and ToT approach enable continuous learning, innovation uptake, and dissemination, ensuring practices evolve with new evidence and technologies. Ongoing engagement with farmers (especially women) ensures local knowledge informs adaptation, enhancing social resilience and uptake. Together, these elements create a dynamic, learning-oriented system capable of adjusting interventions and sustaining impact under future uncertainty. Discussion on the Knowledge Management, Capacity Building, Scaling up, and Resilience design in the Project Description section has been updated accordingly.

h) Different stakeholders? roles, including Village councils & traditional authorities, livestock producer groups, Agri-processors & traders, are described in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). The project approach to engage and consult the stakeholders during project implementation is also elaborated in the SEP. Please refer to Sections 4 and 5 of the SEP.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) No

c) Yes. However please provide some additional details on how the approach of the BGI IP child project can be of value or use for this project.

Agency Response

c) Additional details on potential collaboration with Food System IP Global Child Project (GEF ID 11214), and Coastal Resilience Samoa Child project under the Blue and Green Islands (BGI) IP (GEF project ID 11263) are added. During project implementation, opportunities will be explored to build partnerships and collaborate with the Food System IP Global Child Project (GEF ID 11214) for capacity development, knowledge exchange, and the scaling of best practices, such as (a) capitalizing on Training of Trainers (ToT) modules, and capacity building training on CSA, climate-resilient livestock, circular bioeconomy, and pollution-free food systems, (b) participating in regional workshops bringing Samoa lessons learned to other GEF Food Systems countries, and (c) integrating Samoa?s project outputs into the Global Child Project?s knowledge hub (case studies, policy briefs, datasets, tools). During the implementation, opportunities will be also explored to build partnerships and collaborate with the Coastal Resilience Samoa Child project under the Blue and Green Islands (BGI) IP (GEF project ID 11263). The collaboration will explore aligning recommendations from CSA policy work with coastal governance frameworks (land use, watershed management, fisheries), aligning CSA interventions (livestock, crops, land restoration) with coastal ecosystem priorities (mangroves, reefs, seagrass), promoting CSA practices that directly support coastal resilience, coordinating capacity building and extension systems, and establishing joint knowledge hubs for best practice lessons learned and case studies. These information were also added under the "Cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects" section.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2026

Cleared.

4/24/2026

See follow up comments below.

i) Based on the assignment of CI targets for CI 3 and 4 in the project description (response to Ques. 3) one can assume most of the targets for CI 3 (3200ha of 5000ha) and CI 4 (2000ha of 4000ha) can be classified as improved management practices leading to assisted natural regeneration and avoided degradation. However a significant amount of GEBs will still be accounted for by actual planting of trees. Given this, please ensure there has been no double counting of GEBs between the two targets and given the budget allocation and line items identified, please verify that the GEF funding and co-financing is sufficient to achieve these GEBs.

ii) On the GHG spreadsheet, please note that the values in the sheet, tab ?Dashboard? cells Q7 and Q8, are different from the values stated in the CEO Approval document. While the explanation provided in the CEO Approval document seems fine, those values cannot be found in the spreadsheet. Please clarify. Below is a picture of ?Dashboard? cells Q7 and Q8,

2045	
0	tCO2-eq
-2,044,667	tCO2-eq
-2,044,667 ▼	tCO2-eq

-2,044,667 ▼	tCO2
0	tCO2-eq

3/12/2026

a) Not fully

Core Indicator 6

i) The CEO endorsement document states that the direct GHG mitigation is 1,920,182 tCO2eq from NEXT analysis. However, the NEXT analysis shows a figure of 2,112,200 tCO2eq. Please clarify and amend accordingly;

ii) The ha to be reforested (tree planting) does not match between the CEO Endorsement document, i.e., 2,000 ha, and the NEXT tool, i.e, 2,200 ha (2,000 + 200). Please clarify and/or amend;

iii) Likewise, the ha under crop and grass does not match between the CEO Endorsement document and the NEXT Tool. the 200 ha, 320 ha and 180 ha below have not been included in the CEO document; 4) Finally, on the GHG Ex-ACT spreadsheet, in the tab ?Grassland?, please consider taking a more conservative approach by replacing ?Improved with high inputs? by ?Improved with medium inputs?.

b) Yes

Agency Response

Response to 4/2026 comments:

i) CI 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration (hectare) will cover 4,000 ha. Out of this, 2000 ha in riparian areas where buffer zones and pasture will be restored following improved management and by fencing off livestock. This is described under CI 3 description. This intervention is added separately in row 10 under CROP&GRASS module of the NEXT file. Remaining 2,000 ha of CI3 will cover tree planting in steep slopes. This is also described under the CI 3 description. This intervention is added separately in row 28 under FOREST LAND module of the attached NEXT file.

CI 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectare) will cover 5,000 ha. These will consist of 3,200 ha of livestock land use and 1,800 ha of livestock-coconut agroforestry. These interventions are added in row 11, and 12 under CROP&GRASS module of the attached NEXT file, respectively. Hence, these targets are not double counted, rather added individually, depending on interventions relevant to FOREST LAND and CROP&GRASS LAND in NEXT file, which is consistent with the IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventory.

The budget allocation and line items identified for these interventions from GEF funding, as well as co-financing are identified and verified during the formulation phase by MAF, the project Executing Entity, which again validated during the validation workshop by a wide range of stakeholders.

ii) As explained during the 1st revision response, the GHG emission mitigation values (2,044,667 tCO2-eq) in Q7 and Q8 represents summation of direct (1,858,789 tCO2-eq) and indirect (185,879 tCO2-eq) GHG emission mitigation from NEXT calculation relevant to land use interventions. The project has also intervention relevant to Biogas. Accordingly, GHG emissions avoided by Biogas intervention is also estimated, which is already included in the brief explanation of CI 6 under the core indicator table. Please also refer to the attached Biogas GHG Avoidance Excel file. The GHG emissions avoided from biogas are expected to be 2,098 t CO2eq over 20 years, and this is considered only for direct intervention. Accordingly, total direct GHG emissions mitigation is 1,860,887 t CO2eq, considering the summation of direct GHG emissions of 1,858,789 t CO2eq from NEXT analysis, and 2,098 t CO2eq from GHG emissions avoided due to biogas. Hence, in the CEO Approval document direct GHG emission mitigation is 1,860,887 t CO2eq (1,858,789 from NEXT modeling of Land use related interventions + 2,098 from biogas), and indirect GHG emission mitigation is 185,879 t CO2eq (from NEXT modeling of Land use related interventions).

Response to 3/2026 comments:

c i) The previous NEXT analysis has indicated the value of 1,920,182 tCO2eq for direct GHG emission mitigation represented as unconditional, and 192,018 tCO2eq for Direct GHG emission mitigation, represented as a conditional. The summation of these direct and indirect GHG emission mitigation represents the figure of 2,112,200 tCO2eq. However, please note that the GHG emissions mitigation values (refer to cell# BJ7 and cell# BJ8 in the updated NEXT dashboard worksheet) have now changed due to the update following review comment given in iii)

c ii) 2,000 ha to be reforested (tree planting) represents the direct intervention, and 200 ha represents the indirect intervention. An explanation of the indirect intervention has already been added to the brief explanation for core indicator 6 below the core indicator table. Additionally, in the NEXT file for relevant interventions, it is mentioned that U indicates direct GHG emissions mitigation, and C indicates indirect GHG emissions mitigation.

c iii) Please see the explanation given above. 200 ha, 320 ha and 180 ha represent the indirect intervention; 4) based on the review comment, a more conservative approach is taken by replacing ?Improved with high inputs? with ?Improved with medium inputs. Due to this change, direct and indirect GHG emission mitigation from the NEXT analysis has changed, and the GHG emission mitigation values are updated accordingly in the project document.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/31/2026

Yes. See comments under question 5 above.

Agency ResponsePlease see responses under Section 5 above.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/30/2026

Cleared

3/31/2026

Yes. however please see comments below. We note that FAO has attached Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Template and stakeholder engagement plan. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate.

i. Please clarify whether small scale livestock farmers and other vulnerable populations were consulted during PPG stage, and how the results of consultations were integrated into the project design.

ii. Please clarify whether the project obtained Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples about project design during PPG.

iii. Please ensure small scale livestock farmers and other vulnerable populations are involved in Component 2, not only as beneficiaries, but also as partners of the

Agency Response

i) Small-scale livestock farmers and other vulnerable populations were consulted during the PPG stage through individual consultation by using the Farmers Association, as well as through the National Consultation Workshop on 13 November 2025. Please see the stakeholder consultation record in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Based on the consultation with small-scale livestock farmers and other vulnerable populations, as stated above, and in consultation with MAF, project pilot locations, capacity-building activities, and piloting activities are designed.

ii) In line with donor and international obligations, the project stakeholders were consulted during the Project Preparation phase, following Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), as required under GEF policy, with their roles clearly highlighted in the project document. The project will also ensure, during implementation, Free, Prior, and Informed Consent for communities and families affected, inclusive participation of women, youth, and vulnerable groups, and public consultation and disclosure of social and environmental assessments.

iii) The activity description is now updated by including small-scale livestock farmers and other vulnerable populations, as highlighted in Activities 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.2, and 2.1.2.1.

8 Annexes
Annex A: Financing Tables
8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/a

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework
8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2026

Yes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?
b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?
c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/30/2026

Cleared.

3/12/2026

a) Yes

b) Not fully.

i. Please present the Contracts differentiated between individuals and companies.

ii. Please present details in "National Travel".

iii. The subtotals in budget table don't match the subtotals in Project Description Overview Table - please amend.

c) Yes

Agency Response

i) At this stage, the contracts are not differentiated by individuals and companies. During implementation, the executing entity will select contractors (individuals/farms/companies) through a competitive process.

ii) This refers to national travel by the PMU staff relevant to project activities (piloting, demonstration, awareness raising, and capacity building). This information has been reflected in the budget as well.

iii) The subtotals in the project description overview have been updated and are now consistent with those presented in the budget table.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.
b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.
c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/30/2026

Not at this time. Please see comments to be addressed prior to clearance.

3/31/2026

Not at this time. Please see comments to be addressed prior to clearance.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**3/12/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**3/31/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**4/27/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**4/30/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**5/11/2026**	