



Eighth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (Tranche 2)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11726

Countries

Global (Kyrgyz Republic, Paraguay, Cuba, Albania, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo DR, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Palau, Palestinian Authority, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Afghanistan, Micronesia, Somalia, Benin, China)

Project Name

Eighth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (Tranche 2)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/20/2024

Review completed by PM

10/21/2024

Program Manager

Elsa Temm

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024

cleared.

GRT: 9/23/2024

Not fully.

a) The project meets the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding, responding to GEF-8 Programming Strategy and the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8.

b) please check, however, the number of countries listed in the General Project Information (121) against the number (119) stated in the Project Summary (below). It appears that there are 119 LOIs,

but two countries are requesting LOE (STAR) only. This has implications for the GEF Project Grant amount and subsequent calculations.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

b) The number of countries is confirmed at 119. The project summary has been updated accordingly.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024

cleared.

GRT: 9/23/2024

Not fully

The summary describes problems to be addressed, as well as project objectives and strategies to deliver GEBs and other expected results, including livelihood outcomes and emphasis on social inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups. Mention is made of the SGP 2.0 key features, focus and opportunities, but lacks reference/considerations related to the new SGP 2.0 Operational Guidelines and Results Framework, as well as collaboration opportunities and arrangements with the two new SGP Implementation Agencies.

Please, however, elaborate on the following:

1. The project's specific alignment and adherence to the SGP 2.0 Operational Guidelines and Results Framework.
2. Co-management arrangements/considerations in the five countries (Cuba, Jamaica, Uganda, Venezuela and Sri Lanka) that also have signed LOIs and LOEs with FAO or CI.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

The summary has been elaborated, indicating that specific areas of collaboration with the two additional GEF agencies will be explored during the project preparation phase and outlined in the CEO Endorsement Request, and mentioning alignment and adherence to the SGP 2.0 Operational Guidelines and Results Framework. Additional information on potential synergies with the other two

SGP GEF agencies has been added to the 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects' section of the PIF.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - cleared

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes.

a) Yes. Project objective stated as 'Local CSOs and CBOs in landscapes-seascapes around the world access grant financing and technical assistance, including capacity development and knowledge sharing to maintain and enhance their socioecological resilience, well-being and socio-economic conditions for global environmental benefits'. This is consistent with the approved PIF and CEO endorsement for Tranche 1.

b) Overall, the components and outcomes are appropriate to achieve the project objective and indicators. The Grant ratio, calculated against the Total GEF Financing (\$75, 526,611, inclusive of fees) is 72%. Other components, 3. Knowledge Management and Learning and 4. M&E are set at 3% of the Total Project Cost. *Note that PMC (10%) must be adjusted once the Total GEF Resources and the subsequent Total Project Costs have been checked and adjusted if necessary.*

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

The PMC has been adjusted with the updated value of total GEF financing.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. Important considerations on gender equality and inclusion of other important stakeholders such as youth, indigenous peoples and persons with disabilities are incorporated across the components. In particular Component 2 (2.1.3. *Focused interventions for advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment objectives*; 2.1.4 *Focused interventions on leaving no one*

behind, including Indigenous Peoples, Youth, Persons with Disabilities). In addition, knowledge management and M&E are incorporated as standalone components and are appropriately funded.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - thank you.

GRT: 9/23/2024

a) Yes

b) Yes. Cofinancing is set at a ratio of 1:1 to the GEF Project Grant and outlined in the Indicative Cofinancing Table.

c) Yes. The PMC has been calculated in line with the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements that caps PMC to 10% of the total project costs (net of Agency fee). Please note, however, that updates might be needed based on revisions based on the comments provided above.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

The PMC has been adjusted with the updated value of total GEF financing.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The current situation is clearly and adequately described and includes description of key barriers and enablers.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The project incorporates the long history of successful community-based grant-making and lessons learned developed over 30 years of UNDP SGP implementation. It highlights the links with the GEF-8 strategy and programming directions and the centrality of local action and innovations in meeting global environmental goals. With its focus on CSOs and CBOs, it places a strong emphasis on women groups and women-led organizations and describes the role of MSMEs and partnerships with the private sector. The project furthermore describes the ?Concerted Focus on Youth and Youth Initiatives?.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The theory of change describes the logic and causal pathways of the project, including how activities will address barriers and contribute to the outcomes and goal of the project, including the expected global environmental benefits.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - Cleared

GRT: 9/23/2024

A + b) Mostly. It is noted the project is envisaged to be executed under a direct implementation modality. It is further noted that options for National executing agencies, including NGOs will be explored and continued to be utilized in selected countries, for example, in Brazil, India, and the Philippines. As part of CEO Endorsement submission, please provide an update on any country level discussions and assessments of opportunities for any national execution modalities.

c + d) Not fully. Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects is outlined, and references are made facilitate ?close coordination, at global, regional and local levels with the two new SGP agencies. Considering that GEF resources in at least 5 countries are to be divided

between UNDP and another SGP Implementing Agency, please provide further detail of the (co-management) implementation and execution arrangements in these countries.

In addition, as part of the development of the CEO Endorsement, please provide additional details on the country-level governance structures and national steering committee composition specifically, including efforts to safeguard a non-governmental majority membership of representatives from rights-holders, CSOs, CBOs, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities, Women and Youth groups and organizations, private sector and academia.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

a + b) Confirming that as part of the CEO Endorsement submission, updates on country level discussions and assessments of opportunities for national execution modalities will be provided.

c + d) The following entry has been added to the 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects' section of the PIF:

Areas of collaboration with the other two SGP GEF agencies (FAO and CI) in Cuba, Jamaica, Venezuela and Uganda (FAO), and Sri Lanka (CI) will be explored during the project preparation phase, including on technical matters, joint advocacy, communications, and knowledge sharing efforts, and facilitating their representation on NSCs to ensure synergies with national programming efforts. It is understood that each agency will have fiduciary responsibilities over the approved resources, with UNDP fully relying on its own SGP delivery infrastructure.

Confirming that as part of the CEO Endorsement submission, additional details on country-level governance structures and NSC composition will be provided.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBS (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - cleared

GRT: 9/23/2024

Almost.

Six of the 11 GEF-8 core indicators are to be reported against and have been correctly calculated as per GEF's Guidelines. Reference is made to the SGP-specific Results Framework included in the SGP 2.0 Operational Guidelines for GEF-8, and although the SGP-specific indicators 12 and

13 are not included in the GEF-8 RF, it is noted that UNDP SGP will continue to measure and report on additional indicators beyond core indicators, to enable capture of global-environmental and socio-economic impacts.

However, please provide Name of the Protected Area, WDPA ID, and IUCN Category under core indicator 2.2

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

The names of the protected areas, WDPA IDs and IUCN categories will be provided during the implementation phase, when the specific areas will be decided through development of participatory of updated country programmes and/or landscape-seascape strategies, and upon approval of grant proposals targeting interventions on protected areas. This information has been added to the PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The overall risk rating has been set as Moderate. The key risks, their rating and a Rating Explanation of risk and mitigation measures are addressed in the project concept design and further elaborated on in the SESP Annex D.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The project is based on 30 years of cumulative experience, results, and lessons learned. It is well noted also that the project identifies the GEF-8 Integrated Programs as an opportunity for scaling up and the role of the SGP landscape approach and Country Program Strategies to contribute to improved alignment of national policy beyond. These elements are expected to be further developed and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The project is aligned with the SGP 2.0 thematic priorities as outlined in the GEF-8 Strategy and programming directions. The project references GEF-8 focal area strategies and Integrated Programs. Further details on the project alignment are expected to be incorporated and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement

Agency's Comments

- 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's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. More detailed descriptions of alignment and contribution to MEAs, including UNFCCC, UNCCD, and CBD as well as tentative linkages with the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF) are expected to be incorporated and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. The envisaged biodiversity outcomes of SGP OP8 are aligned with the goals of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), and the program is expected to make contributions towards achievement of a wide range of GBF targets, including targets 1, 2, 3,4,5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - thank you for the additional information - cleared

GRT: 9/23/2024

Mostly. While the project states that *"During the PIF stage, extensive consultations were made with participating countries through the process of discussing and securing Letters of Endorsement (LOEs) and Letters of Interest (LOIs)"* the submission does not really include a list

of these consultations or who was involved. Recognizing, however, that through UNDP's 30-year track record of implementing the SGP, the submission builds on consultations to date. This submission includes six new SGP countries (Angola, Azerbaijan, Montenegro, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe and Somalia) and please provide more details on consultations in these countries. Also, we expect that the forthcoming stakeholder engagement plan clearly outlines information on consultations to date as well as details on approaches to ensuring extensive country level stakeholder consultations during formulation of the SGP OP8 Country Program Strategies.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

Consultations with the countries participating in OP8-Tranche 2, including the new countries, were facilitated by UNDP Country and Regional Offices and SGP National Coordinators (where present) in communication with GEF Operational Focal Points and other national level stakeholders. Additional consultations will be conducted during the project preparation phase (December-June 2025). This information has been added to the PIF.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - cleared

GRT: 9/23/2024

Mostly. Please see comment on General Project Information above about the need for the total number of countries listed to be consistent with the Core resources requested.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

It is acknowledged that the information has been further reviewed in line with the target countries included in the PIF and the requests for Core and STAR resources.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments N/A no PPG requested

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/23/2024

Yes. Cofinancing is outlined in the Indicative Cofinancing Table, including contribution in kind and grants through diverse actors. These will need to be confirmed during the CEO endorsement.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - Cleared.

1. Appreciate updated LOIs and letters and note in particular that the Paraguay LOI has been uploaded and expect at CEO endorsement that all outstanding LOIs are updated and submitted.

2. Appreciate updated letters and LOEs and note in particular that (1) Botswana STAR allocation has been reduced by \$250 to meet the SGP 2.0 requirement that contributed STAR will not exceed 10% of country STAR allocation; and (2) Burundi STAR allocation has been reduced by \$311,438 to not exceed 10% of their STAR allocation

GRT: 9/23/2024

Please note below findings in GEF SEC review of the LOIs and LOEs and address/respond accordingly

LOIs

1. **Angola:** Request confirmation from current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
2. **Barbados:** LOI is missing *?executed by??*. Please check and confirm with current OFP.
3. **Cabo Verde:** LOI states that the executing agency is GEF SGP. Please check with current OFP and correct.
4. **Liberia:** LOI signed by acting deputy. Please check with current OFP that signature is valid.
6. **Montenegro:** LOI is missing *?executed by??*. Please check and confirm with current OFP.
7. **Niger:** Not signed by current OFP. Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
8. **Papua New Guinea:** Please check format of LOI. . Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
9. **Samoa:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
10. **St. Lucia:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
11. **Viet Nam:** LOI is missing *?executed by??*. Please check and confirm with current OFP.
12. **Mauritania:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
13. **Mauritius:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.

14. **Mexico:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
15. **Moldova:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
16. **Paraguay:** No LOI or LOE uploaded into the portal.
17. **Ukraine:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
18. **Vanuatu:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.

LOEs

1. **Barbados:** Please check format. Missing the Agency name.
2. **Bolivia:** Please check the discrepancy between the LOE amount requested (\$1,000,000) and the STAR amount uploaded in the portal and PIF (\$996,255).
3. **Botswana:** Please reduce Botswana STAR by \$250 to meet with SGP2.0 requirement that contributed STAR will not exceed 10% of country STAR allocation and please also check format ? it is missing the Agency name.
4. **Burundi:** Please reduce Burundi STAR by \$311,438 to meet with SGP2.0 requirement that contributed STAR will not exceed 10% of country STAR allocation and please also check format ? it is missing the Agency name.
5. **Lesotho:** Please check format. Missing the Agency name.
6. **Madagascar:** Madagascar - LOE states that the funding will come from LDCF, however on the table it says GEFTF. Also, missing this sentence The STAR resources indicated above are being endorsed for the project listed above and submitted by the GEF Implementing Agency via the GEF Portal.
7. **Mexico:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid.
8. **Papua New Guinea:** Please check and confirm with current registered OFP that the name and signature on the LOI is valid. Please revise format and the amount of STAR requested.
9. **Somalia:** Please revise format and language: *?If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be under the guidance of National Steering Committee?.*

10. **St. Kitts and Nevis:** Please check format. Missing the Agency name.
11. **Uganda:** Please remove Uganda's STAR of \$389,228 (please also note that Uganda has requested a similar STAR amount from both FAO and UNDP in two separate LOEs: for FAO \$1,154,000 dated 11 Sept. For UNDP, dated 29 Jan for 1,543,228. In the case of UNDP, there is also a disparity between the LOE amount, and the amount requested in the PIF and in the GEF portal of \$389,228)
12. **Uzbekistan:** Difference (\$1) between amount requested in the LOE and amount STAR uploaded in the portal and PIF
13. **Viet Nam:** Please revise phrasing *?If approved, the project executed by UNDP Steering Committee?*.
14. **Yemen:** Please check format. Missing the Agency name.
15. **Zambia:** Zambia - LOE not uploaded in the portal. The amount in the portal/PIF is for \$500,000.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

Updated letters have been uploaded in the portal. Also, please note that in response to the guidance received by the GEFSEC in those countries where there were differences between the current OFPs and the names and signatures on the letters, emails from the current OFPs confirming their endorsement to join the UNDP Tranche 2 SGP PIF sourced from the SGP Core resources have been secured and uploaded to the portal.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Not yet. Please provide additional georeferenced information at CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 30 October 2024

Georeferenced information will be available during project implementation, when specific sites will be decided through the process of approving and implementing grant proposals.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. Safeguard screening document has been uploaded and risk ratings are consistent.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/30/2024 - Yes, this PIF is now technically cleared

10/21/2024

Please respond/address comment above.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	9/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		