

# Promoting cleantech innovation for climate action in Senegal

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10715

**Countries**

Senegal

**Project Name**

Promoting cleantech innovation for climate action in Senegal

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

12/9/2021

**Review completed by PM**

5/13/2022

**Program Manager**

Esteban Bermudez Forn

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **CEO Endorsement**

#### **Part I ? Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 05.13.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

In Part 1 (Project information) please adjust the "Expected Implementation Start" to a later date, e.g. July 15, 2022.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes, the project is aligned with CCM-1-4 Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for cleantech innovation.

Agency Response

**Agency Response: 13-May-22**

"Expected Implementation Start" adjusted to July 15, 2022. "Expected Completion Date" has also been adjusted accordingly.

**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  
**EBF, 05.13.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Thank you for your clarifying that the indicator for Output 1.2.4 "Co-finance leveraged by the financial mechanism (in USD)" is mainly in-cash co-finance. To avoid confusion, we kindly request you to make it explicit in "Annex A: Project Results Framework". For example, by including the word "cash," so the indicator reads: "Cash Co-finance leveraged by the financial mechanism (in USD)".

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Please specify if the target indicator for Output 1.2.4 ?Co-finance leveraged by the financial mechanism (in USD)? will consist of cash or in-kind co-finance.

Agency Response  
**Agency Response: 13-May-22**

"Annex A: Project Results Framework" has been amended and includes explicit reference to "cash".

---

The co-financing for this specific indicator refers primarily to in-cash co-financing invested in Cleantech SMEs. In some cases, in-kind could be considered.

**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

**EBF, 05.26.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 05.19.2022**

Regarding the co-finance provided by the "Bureau de Mise à Niveau (BMN)", please address the following comments:

1. In "Sources of co-financing", please replace "Other" by "Recipient Country Government"
2. In "Type of co-financing", please replace "Other" by "Public investment"

You can find an image below with a highlight of the elements that need to be revised:

Other	Bureau de Mise à Niveau (BMN)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000
Other	Bureau de Mise à Niveau (BMN)	Other	Investment mobilized	500,000

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

We welcome your effort to leverage additional co-finance for the project. Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

We understand the difficulties imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic in securing additional co-financing contributions to the project. However, we note a reduction of USD 2.8 million compared to the sources of co-financing presented in the Project Identification Form. Therefore, we encourage you to make efforts to increase the co-financing budget of the project during implementation.

Agency Response

**Agency Response: 24-May-22**

The co-financing table has been amended according to the suggestions.

**Agency Response: 13-May-22**

This is duly noted. The project will seek to leverage further co-financing during project implementation.

- - -

Additional co-financing has been secured (see co-financing table). In particular, i) BMN will provide in-cash (loans/grants/equity) contributions totalling 500,000 USD, leveraged from BMN's network of investors to support the accelerated enterprises access to appropriate financing (grant, loans, equity), and in-kind contributions totalling 250,000 USD; ii) ECREEE will provide in-kind contribution in the amount of 1,200,000 USD, leveraged through its portfolio of active projects that have synergies with the Cleantech Senegal project.

**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  
**EBF, 05.31.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 05.26.2022**

- Thank you for your reply. Your clarification related to the Financial Consultant(s) is noted and cleared.
- 
- Regarding the **National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator and the Project Administration Assistant**, the GEF Project Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy indicates the following concerning project management costs (PMC):
- 
- ?PMC are usually financed from the GEF project financing and co-financing sources ? there should be ?proportionality? between the PMC covered by co-financing amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. The spirit of this decision is that the GEF

trust funds should not bear a disproportionate burden of the total management costs for GEF-financed projects, when co-financing is included.?

- 
- As mentioned in our previous comment on May 19, 2022, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$495,000, and \$5,000,050 is represented in grants. If this co-finance cannot be used to finance these positions, then Terms of Reference will be appropriate and accepted to justify the positions to be charged to the project's components.

**EBF, 05.19.2022**

Regarding the project budget, please address the following comment:

1. National Project Coordination, Project admin assistant and financial consultants have been charged across components and PMC (as you can see in the image below). Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$495,000 and \$5,000,050 is represented in grants ? this could be used to cover the project's staff.

Years 1 - 5											
Expenditure Category	Detailed Description (Activity)	Outcome					Sub-Total	M&E	PMC	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity (*UNIDO's subcontract to executing entities)
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2					
International consultants	financial consultant(s) (Activities 1.1.3b, 1.2.2a, 1.2.2b)	31,000	26,000	-	-	-	57,000	-	-	57,000	MEDD
	technical/business consultant(s) (Activities 1.1.3b, 1.2.1c, 1.2.1d)	31,000	16,200	-	-	-	47,200	-	-	47,200	MEDD
	sub-total	62,000	42,200	-	-	-	104,200	-	-	104,200	MEDD
National staff and consultants	technical/business/policy consultant(s) (Activities 1.1.1b, 1.1.2a, 1.1.2c, 1.1.2e, 1.1.3b, 1.2.1c, 1.2.1d, 2.1.1c)	22,500	17,400	-	-	-	39,900	-	-	39,900	MEDD
	financial consultant(s) (Activities 1.1.3b, 1.2.1c, 1.2.2a, 1.2.2b, 2.1.1c)	10,000	24,800	-	-	-	34,800	-	-	34,800	MEDD
	environmental and social consultant(s) (Activities 1.1.1b, 1.1.2a, 1.1.3b, 1.2.1c, 3.2.1c)	9,500	14,800	-	-	5,000	29,300	-	-	29,300	MEDD
	gender consultant (Activities 1.1.1b, 1.1.2a, 1.1.3b, 1.2.2a, 1.2.2b)	8,500	5,000	-	-	-	13,500	-	-	13,500	MEDD
	policy expert(s) (Activity 2.1.2b)	-	-	7,000	-	-	7,000	-	-	7,000	MEDD
	National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator	22,786	22,616	14,272	10,043	6,543	76,259	12,666	34,416	123,341	MEDD
	Project Administration Assistant	15,629	17,403	13,608	7,303	4,406	58,349	10,334	28,109	96,792	MEDD
sub-total	88,915	102,019	34,880	17,346	15,949	259,108	23,000	62,525	344,633	MEDD	
<b>YEARS 1 - 5 TOTAL</b>		<b>Outcome 1.1</b>	<b>Outcome 1.2</b>	<b>Outcome 2.1</b>	<b>Outcome 3.1</b>	<b>Outcome 3.2</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>M&amp;E</b>	<b>PMC</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
Outcomes		944,828	1,412,219	280,880	56,846	175,949	2,870,721	100,000	137,886	3,108,607	
Components			2,357,047	280,880		232,794					

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

The marginal adjustment has been overused. Please revise Table D to reduce overuse of marginal adjustment for CC of \$93,410.13.

Agency Response

**Agency Response: 27-May-22**

As requested, we are providing the Terms of Reference for the National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator as well as for the Project Administration Assistant, listing the respective general and component-specific duties. The draft TORs have been uploaded to the Roadmaps -> Documents section of the project.

Document Title	Category	Prefix
Terms of Reference_National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator	Project Supporting Document	Others
Terms of Reference_National Project Administration Assistant	Project Supporting Document	Others

**Agency Response: 24-May-22**

Regarding the latest comment on the budget, we would like to provide some clarification on the approach taken:

- the **financial consultant(s)** are not members of the project management team (i.e. will not advise the overall project execution). These consultants bring specific expertise on topics related to SME/start-ups/project financing to the project. Their expertise will primarily serve the project in two forms: a) to provide capacity building around access to finance to entrepreneurs supported under the project/programme; and b) to enable and facilitate communication with and access to potential investors;

- with regards to the **National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator** and the **Project Administration Assistant** (PMU), the rationale behind the approach taken is as follows: On top of pure project management, the PMU will also be responsible for delivering on some specific technical activities under the project. The TORs, which will be drafted and annexed to the agreement to be signed between the PEE and UNIDO, will refer to the activities the PMU will be conducting. In addition, the salary totals for

both staff members over five years may not be sufficiently covered by the project finance, the co-financing will therefore be used to cover the deficit.

---

The budget has been reduced by \$93,410.13.

### **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

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

A report for the PPG activities and available balances is provided. However:

1. A portion of the PPG amount is still unspent. Please indicate if this will be spent before the policy deadline (within one year of the CEO endorsement).

Agency Response Well noted. The remaining PPG amount is indeed envisaged to be spent within one year of the CEO Endorsement. A sentence on this has been introduced in the text box for Annex C.

**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

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Core indicator targets remain realistic, and methodologies have been provided.



Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 050.05.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Please address the comments below:

1. The first barrier described (?Limited capacity to develop / scale-up and limited awareness among SMEs / entrepreneurs about cleantech opportunities?) focuses on SMEs / entrepreneurs. However, in this barrier?s description, it is stated that ?Awareness should be created at all levels: for policy-makers, investors, private sector, development institutions, associations, etc.?. Please revise and consider if other stakeholders aside from SMEs / entrepreneurs should be addressed in this barrier.

Agency Response Noted. The following has been added: "Beyond SMEs and entrepreneurs, the awareness of potential cleantech opportunities should be raised among all stakeholders who participate in the CIEE (from investors to development institutions, associations and policy-makers)." For easier reference, the amended parts have been highlighted in yellow.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Thank you for your clarification. Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

The baseline scenario is well elaborated. Just a minor comment, have you mapped ?Acc?l?rateur de Croissance TIC? known as CTIC Dakar (cticdakar.com)? Considering that ?most of the activities will occur in Dakar, where the main stakeholders are located?, we invite you to consider them as part of Table 6: Relevant ongoing projects and initiatives? If not, please justify the reason to leaving them outside the baseline scenario.

**Agency Response** Yes, Acc?l?rateur de Croissance TIC (or CTIC) has been mapped. It has been included in the baseline report (Annex L) at page 66, among the list of identified stakeholders, under relevant existing accelerators and incubators. They have not been included in Table 6 as this table refers to projects rather than specific institutions (we did not include other accelerators and incubators in this table). The following has been added in Table 14: "Accelerators & Incubators (identified in the baseline report)". Changes have also been reflected in the stakeholder engagement plan (Annex K). Indeed, during project implementation, synergies with existing accelerators will be sought, where possible.

**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**  
**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Previous comments are cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

The proposed alternative scenario is well described. Please address the comments below:

1. Minor correction, Paragraph 54 of the ?Project Description? should refer to Figure 8 instead of Figure 7.
2. Output 1.1.2 addresses a certification system for cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship experts (trainers, mentors and judges). Please elaborate on who will adapt the certification and on who will certify these stakeholders. Are these separate entities?
3. Output 2.1.2, focuses on policy recommendations. However, considering that:
  1. Two of the barriers identified are: (1) ?lack of mechanisms to coordinate institutional efforts and market actors? interventions? and (2) ?limited or insufficient policy, regulatory and incentive framework?.

2. The baseline scenario states that ??there are no policies or incentives specifically targeting the SME cleantech market sector?
3. There is a recently approved ?start-up Act? in the country

Please, revise Output 2.1.2 to ensure that you go beyond policy recommendations and explore how the GEF project can take specific actions to address the aforementioned barriers and statements in a more concrete way.

#### Agency Response

Thank you.

1. Paragraph 54 amended (see parts highlighted in yellow);
2. Under the GCIP Global Programme (GEF ID 10408) a cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship expert training and certification system will be developed. Leveraging on the linkage to the GCIP, the project will tap into the knowledge created under the GCIP Programme, which includes the certification system. The certification system is however developed under the Global Programme and is therefore not tailored to the Senegalese context. As part of the project, the PEE will review and adapt the training and certification system. The actual execution of this activity will be the responsibility of the PEE. The PEE will be able to directly execute or partner with another entity to perform and grant the certification.
3. Further inputs have been added in paragraphs 112 and 116 (see parts highlighted in yellow).
- 4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared. Alignment is observed.?

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.

Yes, the project document outlines incremental reasoning, the contribution from the baseline, and co-financing.

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

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

A detailed description of the calculation of the greenhouse gas emission reduction calculation is provided.

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

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

This section is well elaborated.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes this is provided. Cleared.

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

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.?

Yes, a stakeholder consultation report during the design stage has been provided. It includes an adequate stakeholder engagement plan.

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.

Yes, gender analysis has been completed, and an action plan has been laid out.

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  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.

Yes, the private sector will be a key stakeholder in the project ? especially SMEs and start-ups. Private sector representatives were consulted during the design stage. The project also expects to work with private sector financing institutions and industry and business associations.

Agency Response  
**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.

Yes, the project elaborates on potential risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks, as well as COVID-19 related risks and opportunities.

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  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.?

Yes, the institutional arrangements have been described. The Directorate of Environment and Classified Establishments (DEEC, Direction de l'Environnement et des Etablissements Class?s), will be the Executing Agency of the project. The DEEC is part of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Senegal (MEDD, Minist?re de l'Environnement et du D?veloppement Durable)

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  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.

Yes, the project is consistent with national priorities.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes, a KM approach is described.

Agency Response

**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  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared.?

Yes, a M&E plan is included and budgeted.?

Agency Response  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes, socioeconomic benefits are properly described. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**



Cleared.?

Required annexes are included.?

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared. Council comments have been properly addressed. Responses are provided in Annex B.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Cleared. STAP comments have been properly addressed. Response to STAP comments is provided in Annex B.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Cleared.

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

A report for the PPG activities and available balances is provided. However:

1. A portion of the PPG amount is still unspent. Please indicate if this will be spent before the policy deadline (within one year of the CEO endorsement).

Agency Response The remaining PPG amount is indeed envisaged to be spent within one year of the CEO Endorsement.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Yes this is provided. Cleared.

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

**EBF, 5.31.2022**

The PM recommends for CEO endorsement.

**EBF, 05.26.2022**

Please address the comment above related to the National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator and the Project Administration Assistant positions.

**EBF, 05.19.2022**

Regarding the co-finance provided by the "Bureau de Mise ? Niveau (BMN)", please address the following comments:

1. In "Sources of co-financing", please replace "Other" by "Recipient Country Government"
2. In "Type of co-financing", please replace "Other" by "Public investment"

Regarding the project budget, please address the following comment:

1. National Project Coordination, Project admin assistant and financial consultants have been charged across components and PMC (as you can see in the image below). Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$495,000 and \$5,000,050 is represented in grants ? this could be used to cover the project's staff.

**EBF, 05.13.2022**

The PM recommends for CEO endorsement.

**EBF, 05.05.2022**

Please address the following comments:

1. In Part 1 (Project information) please adjust the "Expected Implementation Start" to a later date, e.g. July 15, 2022.
2. Thank you for your clarifying that the indicator for Output 1.2.4 "Co-finance leveraged by the financial mechanism (in USD)" is mainly in-cash co-finance. To avoid confusion, we kindly request you to make it explicit in "Annex A: Project Results Framework". For example, by including the word "cash," so the indicator reads: "Cash Co-finance leveraged by the financial mechanism (in USD)".

**EBF, 01.18.2022**

Not at this time, the Agency is requested to address the comments in the review sheet and resubmit.

**\*\* Please highlight in yellow the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. \*\***

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/18/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/5/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/13/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/19/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/26/2022</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**