



# Adapting to climate change and enabling sustainable land management through productive rural communities in Timor-Leste

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10713

**Countries**

Timor Leste

**Project Name**

Adapting to climate change and enabling sustainable land management through productive rural communities in Timor-Leste

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

8/15/2022

**Review completed by PM**

3/11/2023

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

As this project uses LDCF funding, the Rio Marker value for Adaptation should be 2.

**Agency Response**

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

Thank you of pointing out. The change has been made in the portal.

**Project description summary**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/3/2023:**

Cleared.

3/20/2023:

Not yet. Corrections are requested.

Whereas the difference in the Agency Fee has been amended, with the latest submission the figures for GEF Financing in Table D have been modified and are incorrect. At PIF stage the amount from GET was \$3,578,536 and from LDCF was \$6,267,126. These amounts ? which match those in the CEO letter? were correct in the previous submission of the CEO Endorsement. However, the amounts have been changed in the latest version (now showing as \$3,567,373 from GET, and \$6,277,925 from LDCF). These amounts do not match those in the CEO letter, i.e., they are incorrect in the current submission.

Requested action: Please correct the GEF funding amounts shown in Table D in the online CEO endorsement request. Please ensure the amounts are correctly reflected throughout the Portal entry as well as all relevant annexes.

Updated comment, GEF Sec, 11/11/2022:

Adjustment is requested: There is difference in fee funded from LDCF between CEO endorsement and PIF stage of \$162 dollars ? please amend, thank you.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Yes. No change from PIF.

#### Agency Response

UNEP response 22/03/2023

Thank you for the comments. The correct figures have been inserted in table D of the portal. The figures in table D is now same as figures approved in PIF.

UNEP response 30/01/ 2023

Thank you for this feedback. Adjustment has been done in the portal and table D of CEO ER .

**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

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Adjustments are requested.

- a) The amounts specified in the uploaded co-financing letters do not match/align with what it indicated in the Table C rows. Kindly ensure an exact match. Please ensure also that all co-finance letters specify whether in-kind, grant or loan financing is being provided. Please also aim to include a link to the co-finance letter at the end of each row in Table C where possible.
- b) In Table C, the row for the GCF-LDCF project states that the finance is both grant and recurrent. As per the GEF co-finance policy, this is an invalid categorization. Kindly adjust.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

Co-finance letters of EU GCCA, NDCC, GCF readiness, Mitra, Progreso, Sucafina has been revised specifying grant, loan and in-kind co-finance. The co-finance amount is revised and now match with Table C. The revised co-finance letters are attached in the Pro. Doc. Changes are made in portal so that in-kind is reflected as recurrent and grant as investment mobilized.

**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 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

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

23/2/23:

Cleared.

Updated comment, GEF Sec, 11/11/2022:

#### Land Degradation:

Core Indicators : (i) Please request agency to correct the target in the results framework (appendix A) to be consistent with the core indicator table for the indicator 4. The core indicator target states 16,700ha but the results framework notes 22,000ha. (ii) Please include the Results Framework in Portal (currently missing).

GEF Sec, 11/4/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Not yet. Adjustments are requested for the CCA indicators. Cleared for LD.

#### CCA indicators:

Of the list of outputs identified in the review of 9/15, only 2.1.2 appears to be addressed. The others are still blank. We see from the agency response that entries should be visible, but they are not.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Adjustments are requested for both LD and CCA.

#### Land degradation:

Core Indicator 4 note indicates:

?Core Indicator 4 (total 22,200) consist of (i) 10,500 ha forest protection for watershed functions under output 2.2.2 (with co-benefit BD conservation), where the project will target keeping current degradation levels (as opposed to ?without? scenario where degradation would significantly increase); plus (ii) 4,000 ha communal grazing land in target sucos under improved livestock management to reduce land degradation in grassland and associated woody vegetation (output 2.2.3); as well as (iii) 2,200 ha new or upgraded agro-forest systems (output 3.2.1) moving from annual to perennial crops ? mainly in Cocoa/Vanilla systems

(identified as hotspots in CRIWDPs). Included under the total ha of forest protected are 4,500 ha of forest restored under Output 2.2.1 which is included under Core Indicator 3. 3.?

It is not clear how the total of 22,200 ha for Core Indicator 4 was arrived at given these details. Please clarify. In addition, the targeted ha associated with Output 2.2.2 (10,500ha) are better suited under sub-indicator 4.1 and please also ensure that the 4,500ha under Output 2.2.1 are only counted once under sub-indicator 3.3. Please ensure any changes are reflected throughout the project documents.

b. Core Indicator 6- Thank you for including the Ex-ACT information in Appendix 6, we are unable to find the EX-ACT excel worksheet. Please upload this as well.

Climate Change Adaptation:

1) Meta-information: Timor Leste is included in the World Bank's FY22 list of fragile states. Please select the "True" checkbox for this item.

2) At PIF stage, the project estimated placing 71,300 ha of land under climate-resilient management. This does not appear in the CEO Endorsement LDCF results framework. Please correct.

3) A comparison of the Expected Outputs of Table B with the results framework shows that there is opportunity to select several relevant indicators for this project, including:

Output 1.1.1: Number of irrigation or water structures; No of ha of forest; etc

Output 1.1.2: select the livelihoods to be strengthened

Output 1.1.3: Select the climate hazards to be addressed;

Output 1.1.4: Select the ecosystem(s) where resilience measures will be undertaken;

Output 1.2.2: Select relevant choices depending on proposed agricultural value chain activities.

Output 2.1.2: Institutional partnerships strengthened/expanded;

Output 2.1.4: No. of vulnerability assessments conducted;

Output 3.3.1: Number of people trained (by category)

Please add values/selections corresponding to the relevant sub-indicator categories for the LDCF results framework.

**Agency Response**

UNEP response 30/01/ 2023

i) The target in result framework (Appendix 3 of Pro. Doc) has been revised to reflect the correct figure of 16,700 ha. to made consistent with core indicator table for the indicator 4.

ii) The revised Results Framework has been uploaded and also annexed as Appendix 3.

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

- a) Sorry for the calculation errors. The number of ha under Core indicator 4 has now been changed to a total of 16,700. The initial figure of 22,200 ha did indeed include 5,500 ha of land that was both stated under improved management (Core Indicator 4) as well as restoration (Core Indicator 3). The revised figure of 16,700 ha removed the issue of double counting and 5,500 ( 1,000 ha agricultural land restored under indicator 3.1 and 4,500 ha forest restored under Indicator 3.2)is counted only in Core Indicator 3. The documents have been revised throughout to reflect this change. Please refer to changes in section 3.1 of the Project Document and Section F as well as Annex F in the CER ER. Also, 10,500ha in output 2.2.2 is counted under sub-indicator 4.1.
- b) Sorry the EX?ACT excel worksheet has now been is uploaded in the portal.
- c) The "True" checkbox in the Meta-information has bene checked with regards Timor Leste is being included in the World Bank's FY22 list of fragile states

### **Response02/11/2022**

The 71,300 figure - originally stated at PIF phase has been added in the Result Framework. Please refer to Appendix 3 and page 202 of Project Document.

With regards the suggestion to add indicators to the GEF7 LDCF Results Framework, we have added:

Output 1.1.1: Number of irrigation or water structures: 40

Output 1.1.2: select the livelihoods to be strengthened : agriculture, pastoralism, enhanced access to markets; beekeeping and enhanced access to employment.

Output 1.1.3: Select the climate hazards to be addressed: flood drought, landslides and erosion, wildfires AND ?climate information collected?: hydrology and water availability AND ?mode of climate information dissemination?: extension services and validation workshops.

Output 1.1.4: Select the ecosystem(s) where resilience measures will be undertaken: mountainous, forest and inland water.

Output 1.2.2: Financial instruments or models to enhance climate resilience: PPP models and cooperatives

Output 2.1.2: Institutional partnerships strengthened/expanded: 1;

Output 2.13: Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation: 1

Output 2.1.4: No. of vulnerability assessments conducted: 4

### **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, 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 11/1/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Further information is requested.

#### Land degradation

Component 4- The linkage to LDN is completely absent. As this is an integrated project, please consider KM activities related to the benefits of the project in achieving LDN and the potential contribution to achieving LDN targets. This would also need to be considered in the MEL, which currently only states "Progress of the implementation of the CRIWDPs will be monitored and the impact and scalability of EbA measures (Component 2) and agribusinesses for sustainable commodity production (Component 3) will be assessed?".

Agency Response

#### **UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

Significant revisions and strengthening have been made to integrate LDN into KM activities; as well as MEL has been expanded upon to make these linkages clear. Text has been added in the project description in ProDoc section 3.3. and the CEO ER throughout Component 4 to weave the LDN linkage in. To address this comment, changes were made in several sections of the document. Revisions were made throughout Component 4 and relevant Output descriptions to integrate the LDN link with MEL activities. Please see paragraphs 144 and 151 of the CEO Endorsement Request, and paragraphs 264 and 270 of the Project Document.

To further strengthen the link between LDN and Component 4, the text relating to replicability and scaling up (directly related to Component 4 activities) was also revised. Please see changes reflected in paragraphs 178-186 in the CEO ER and paragraphs 284-292 in the Project Document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 11/1/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/22:

Further information is requested.

Land degradation:

In reference to LDN (both at the enabling environment level and on the ground implementation), how is this being embedded into local level governance systems. Only EBA mentioned. In addition are there plans to continue the Cross-sectoral working group on climate resilience and LDN or a similar mechanism to ensure continuity of the approaches and interventions introduced by the project? Will this working group be institutionalized or embedded in an existing Ministry or Agency?

## Agency Response

### **UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The integration of LDN as enabling environment and its subsequent application at on-the-ground level has been included in sections 3.8 and 3.9 of the Project Document, as well as text strengthened in section 3.3 on project description. Further details on long term plans for CSWG groups ? including mechanisms for institutionalization ? has been included. Please refer to section 3.8 and 3.9 of the Project document and sustainability section of CEO ER (p.79). Text has been added throughout the document to strengthen the linkage with LDN. Please refer to additional text in para 63, 64, 65, 66, 68 in CEO Endorsement and para 187, 189 in Project Document.

Under output 2.1.3, Facility Management Groups (GMFs), community driven local structure will be strengthened to engage them in water management activities, reforestation and revegetation at Suco level. Cross Sectoral working group (CSWG) will be established under output 1.1.2 with representatives from several ministries, including The Centre for Integrated Disaster Management, The State Secretary for the Environment, The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, and The Ministry of Social Solidarity and Inclusion. CSWG will be institutionalised within the executing ministry. The responsibility of CSWG will be to address barriers of LDN and climate change adaptation and integrate them into national policies and plan.

### **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

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

## Agency Response

### **Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

## Agency Response

### **Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation**

**phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Adjustment is requested:

The Stakeholders section refers to "Table 10" but this is not visible in the Portal online entry. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been included in the uploaded compiled GEF-UNEP appendices.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The Table 10 in the portal has now been included in the uploaded information.

**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

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes. A Gender Analysis and Action Plan has been included in the uploaded compiled GEF-UNEP appendices document.

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

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Unclear.

At PIF stage, the Portal entry stated "Yes" for private sector engagement and provided a short

para that concluded with the sentence: "Engagement with prospective private sector partners will be undertaken during the PPG phase of the proposed project to ensure the maximum impact of these partnerships during project implementation." At CEO Endorsement, there is no affirmation that the private sector will be engaged, and the para under the Private Sector heading is similar to PIF stage. No further details or updates have been provided. Please update this section, and discuss the PPG consultations as well as further specifics of how the project will further private sector engagement in adaptation in Timor Leste.

#### Agency Response

##### **UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

Details on private sector engagement and private partnerships has been entirely rewritten and been integrated into the project document (Section 5- par.328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333) and CEO ER (Section 4 - also par. 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205. Details on private sector co-financing is stated under the Co-finance tables in ProDoc (Table 10).

##### **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, 9/15/2022:

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

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes, institutional arrangements for project implementation have been adequately described. Coordination with relevant GEF and non-GEF initiatives, including GCF initiatives, has been discussed.

#### 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

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Further information is requested:

Of the various adaptation-related plans and strategies, only the Strategic Development Plan for Timor Leste appears current. Are there any other current climate or disaster related strategic plans, policies or frameworks for Timor Leste that the project aligns with?

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The relevant section has been updated to include updated relevant plans and strategies. Please refer to section 3.6 in Pro.Doc and table 13 in CEO ER.

**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, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Not yet.

At PIF review stage, specific further information had been requested by CEO Endorsement on KM activities. The section on KM is the same at CEO Endorsement as it was at PIF stage.

The para refers to Annex 4 and Annex 5 yet these have not been uploaded. Please ensure that the PIF -stage comments for KM have been addressed within the KM section Portal entry, and please ensure that any supplementary information is viewable in the uploaded document of compiled GEF-UNEP appendices.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The text in the knowledge management section has been revised to better address this comment, including further detailed on what knowledge products the project will capture and how stakeholder groups will be engaged.

Please note the changes in Table 6 and paragraphs 221 and 222 of the CEO document, as well as Table 18 of the Project Document.

#### **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

23/2/23:

Cleared.

Updated comment, GEF Sec, 11/11/2022:

Not yet. The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP has attached Appendix 19. Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) with a clear budget, responsibility, and timeline. However, Appendix 19 ESMP does not include risks related to Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement (Safeguard Standard 6) and Indigenous Peoples (Safeguard 7) although these are moderate risks. Only the table in the Portal includes brief information about a risk management related to Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement (Safeguard Standard 6) and Indigenous Peoples (Safeguard 7) mentioning Output 2.2.1 to 2.2.3. Please include risk management measures related to the Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement (Safeguard Standard 6) and Indigenous Peoples (Safeguard 7) in the ESMP in Appendix 19. [Note: The project PIF was approved on June 18, 2021, after the Policy on ESS had gone into effect.]

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

#### Agency Response

UNEP response 30/01/ 2023

The team has revisited SRIF rating to take account of the information gathered during the PPG phase. In consultation with Safeguard expert of UNEP, SS 6 and SS 7 are now rated as low risk.

The project will not result in displacement and involuntary settlement and will not have negative impact on indigenous people. The Environmental and Social Safeguards workplan has been prepared to facilitate the project implementation team to take mitigation measures for any anticipated risk in these safeguard standards during implementation phase. Section 3 of SRIF has been revised with justification for the change.

As the project works in climate vulnerable sites, safeguard standard 2 on climate change and disaster risks have been rated as medium and ES workplan is revised with detail of mitigation measures proposed within the project.

#### **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

4/3/2023:

Cleared.

3/20/2023:

Not yet. The comment provided on 11/11/2022 has not yet been addressed.

(a) in the M&E budget in Section 9 of the CEO Endorsement Request (Monitoring and Evaluation), a line has been included for Audit (with indicative cost of USD30,000). This needs to be removed from the M&E budget and charged to PMC.

(b) In line item 2104 of the budget table in Annex E, the Audit has been mapped to the M&E section of the budget. It needs to be charged to PMC.

Requested action: Please charge the Audit to PMC and not to the M&E budget. Please ensure this correction is made at all relevant places including any uploaded annexes.

Updated comment, GEF Sec, 11/11/2022:

The audit should be charged under PMC, not under the M&E budget.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

UNEP response: 22/03/2023

In the last re-submission, we had moved the audit budget from the M&E budget to the PMC budget and tried to make the changes in the copy-pasted excel sheet in Annex E. Unfortunately the changes did not stick. This time we have added the image of the revised budget in Annex E in Portal.

We have also removed Audit from M&E table (please refer to the table in page 130 in CEO ER) and Costed M&E plan in Appendix 6 in the appendices document as well as Appendix 6 in the prodoc.

UNEP response 30/01/ 2023

The audit is now charged under PMC. The changes have been reflected throughout the document and revised budget sheet has been uploaded in the portal.

**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

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Please discuss how the project will deliver benefits in the context of green recovery in the COVID context. In addition to impacts from direct incidence of COVID, the pandemic has taken a major economic toll on many small islands.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

This point has been integrated into section 3.1 of the ProDoc (para 119) and Section 10 (Benefits) of the CEO ER (para 228).

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Adjustments are requested.

A document titled 'GEF annexes' has been uploaded to the Documents section but does not contain all the annexes that are listed in the Table of Contents. Please ensure that the 'GEF Annexes document' contains ALL annexes, as well as those review responses to required sections which the agency has placed in an annex (there are currently some annexes uploaded separately, which makes it confusing to locate a particular one). Please note that as per the Joint Summary of the Chairs for the June 2021 Council Meeting, this project will be circulated for 4-week Council review prior to Endorsement. In addition to the CEO Endorsement Request (Portal Entry), we will also be circulating an additional single document, which should contain all annexes.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

Single Pro. Doc has been prepared with all appendixes attached and uploaded in portal

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 10/31/22:  
Cleared.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

No, we are unable to locate this.

A document titled 'GEF annexes' has been uploaded to the Documents section but does not seem to contain the results framework, although it is in the Table of Contents. Please ensure that the 'GEF Annexes document' contains all annexes. There are currently some annexes uploaded separately as well, which makes it confusing to locate a particular one.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The updated Result Framework has been added in the single document with annexes, and uploaded.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 11/4/22:  
Cleared.

GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Not yet. The table is not displaying yet.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

No. The responses to the PIF-stage GEF Sec review comments need to be tabulated and included in the Portal entry.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The GEF Sec review comments have been tabulated and entered in the portal

**Response\_02/11/2022**

The responses to the PIF-stage GEF Sec review comments are tabulated and included in the Portal entry. Reviewed to to see they show clearly.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEF Sec, 10/31/22:

Yes.

GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

No. The responses to Council comments (Germany, United States) provided at PIF approval stage need to be tabulated and included in the Portal entry.

Agency Response

**UNEP response 11 Oct 22:**

The response to council comments have been added in Annex B of CEO-ER.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

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 GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 9/15/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/3/2023:

Yes, cleared.

3/20/2023:

Not yet. Please address the comment in item 2 of Part I of the review sheet, as well as the comment in the 'Monitoring and Evaluation' section.

Updated comment, GEF Sec, 11/11/2022:

Not yet. The agency is requested to please: (i) adjust the difference in fee (\$162) for LDCF between PIF and CEO endorsement stages; (ii) adjust land degradation core indicator and include the results framework; (iii) include risk management measures related to the Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement in the ESMP in Appendix 19; and (iv) charge the audit to the PMC instead of the M&E budget.

GEF Sec, 11/4/22:

Yes.

GEF Sec, 11/1/22:

Not yet. Please enter the Output indicator values for LDCF and the response matrix to GEF SEC review comments provided at PIF stage.

GEF Sec, 9/20/2022:

Not yet. Please address the review comments. (Please note that once the GEF Sec review is completed, this project will need to go for 4-week Council Review prior to Endorsement, as specified in the Joint Summary of the Chairs for the June 2021 Council Meeting.)

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/20/2022</b>	<b>10/28/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/1/2022</b>	<b>11/3/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/4/2022</b>	<b>1/30/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/11/2022</b>	<b>4/1/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/23/2023</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**