



Eldoret-Iten Water Fund for Tropical Water Tower Conservation

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10209

Countries

Kenya

Project Name

Eldoret-Iten Water Fund for Tropical Water Tower Conservation

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

11/26/2021

Review completed by PM

5/31/2022

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

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

12-8-21: Yes, the project remains aligned with the BD and LD focal area elements.

Expected date of implementation is before the CEO Endorsement Deadline. Please revise and adjust for the expected 36 months completion.

**Expected
Implementation
Start**

1/24/2022

**Expected
Completion
Date**

12/31/2024

Duration ⓘ

36

In Months

Agency Response

21 April 2022

The start and completion dates have been adjusted to 01/06/2022 to 30/05/2025. Please see the CEO endorsement document.

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

12-8-21: Project structure is adequate. Please revise the co-financing PMC in order to reflect the proportionality principle. 04-28-22: Please adjust the PMC values in Table B in the the Portal. The table is still showing the previous values as follows:

	Sub Total (\$)	2,505,139
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ		
	GET	125,000
	Sub Total(\$)	125,000
	Total Project Cost(\$)	2,630,139

Agency Response

21 April 2022

This PMC proportion has been revised in the GEF only and cost tabs budgets in the excel sheets. The revisions can be found in the sections in yellow highlights

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 12-8-21: There are a few letters of co-financing missing (government, beneficiaries). Please attach missing letters for further review.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

1. A Government co-financing letter has been included from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry for co-financing provided by KWTA and KFS.

2. Beneficiaries will make in kind contributions individually by working on their land and contributing labour and local materials to farm level and community level investments. IFAD will report on the beneficiary contribution during every supervision mission and at mid term and end of project stages. This will be done as part of the review of fiduciary aspects of the project. A letter in support of commitment to beneficiary contributions from the Sosian Water Resource User Association, which covers the catchment areas that the project will be implemented in is attached.

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

12-8-21: Proposed financing is adequate.

04-28-22: There is a \$2 difference in fee under table D between PIF stage and CEO endorsement stage, please revise the table D at CEO endorsement stage to make it matched with PIF:

PIF stage table D							CEO Endorsement stage table D							Differences				
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)	Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IFAD	GET	Kenya	Biodiversi	BD STAR Allocation	979,684	93,068	1,072,752	IFAD	GET	Kenya	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	979,684	93,070	1,072,754	-	(2)	(2)
IFAD	GET	Kenya	Land Degr	LD STAR Allocation	1,650,455	156,793	1,807,248	IFAD	GET	Kenya	Land Degrad	LD STAR Allocation	1,650,455	156,793	1,807,248	-	-	-
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,630,139	249,861	2,880,000	Total Grant Resources(\$)					2,630,139	249,863	2,880,002	-	(2)	(2)

Please revise.

Agency Response

27 May 2022

Corrected table D accordingly.

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

12-8-21: PPG utilization is adequately reported in Annex C.

04-28-22: PPG approved was \$91,325, but not \$93,325 as reported in annex C, please revise Annex C accordingly.

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required true

PPG Amount (\$)  PPG Agency Fee (\$)
91,325 8,675

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds 	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IFAD	GET	Kenya	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	34,016	3,231	37,247.00
IFAD	GET	Kenya	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	57,309	5,444	62,753.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					91,325.00	8,675.00	100,000.00

ANNEX C: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement approval date. Agencies should report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount (in USD)	Amount Spent To date (in USD)	Amount Committed (in USD)
Subcontract to The Nature Conservancy for project design planning and hosting, stakeholder engagement, formation of the steering committee, evaluation of the WOCAT technologies, FPIC meetings, piloting conservation technologies, national level BD and LDN dialogues and report target setting, learning trip to the UTNWFP project sites.	53,350	80% of the total	53,350
Mission composed of consultants (honoraria and travel) to provide overall technical support to project design	35,850	100% of the total	35,850
Total	92,325		92,325

Agency Response
27 May 2022

The PPG figures in Annex C have been adjusted to reflect a total cost of USD 91,325

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

Agency Response

21 April 2022

The METT tool is provided with initial estimates. It will be part of the project baseline study during initial implementation phase of the project and the resultant scores will be updated accordingly.

The work targeted is very intensive as it involves re-planning forest access and use, grazing management with inevitable accommodation of wildlife browsers, rehabilitating highly degraded parts of natural forests and ensuring improvements in ground cover. There is also a lot of community mobilisation that will be required. Given the intensity of the work and project duration, 15,862 ha is considered a realistic to target.. Success in this area will see local partners scale up interventions to other areas or replicate the model to other catchments.

The initial estimates were rough estimates. IFAD used the Ex-Ante Carbon Accounting Tool (EXACT) developed by FAO to account for GHG emissions reduction . The analysis included other sectors that had not been included in the initial estimates, namely: pasture biomass; biogas etc. These current figures are obtainable.

22,500 are those community members who will directly benefit and who will directly work on the 5,000 individual farms, on improving agricultural productivity and promoting sustainable land management practices. 130,000 are all indirect beneficiaries/persons who will gain positively from the project. Therefore, 22,500 are the direct beneficiaries (4.5 household members per individual farm) while the 130,000 are indirect beneficiaries.

27 May 2022

Core indicators have been realigned with the Project's Results Framework as indicated in the updated Annex A

GEF Core indicators explicitly mentioned and included in the updated Annex A

Updated information on the Protected Areas (PA) and separated PA information from METT score as indicated in the revised GF7-BD Tracking Tool-Protected Areas.

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

12-8-21: The proposal presents substantial elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

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

12-8-21: Baseline scenario and associated projects are adequately described.

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

12-8-21: Components and proposed outcomes are adequately described.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-8-21: The alignment with the strategies of the BD and LD focal areas is satisfactory

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-8-21: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

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

12-8-21: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily in relation to better elaboration of the expected contributions to GEBs and adaptation benefits. The project represents a good opportunity to conserve globally significant biodiversity and protect the integrity and resilience of critical ecosystems in key watersheds in Kenya.

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

12-8-21: This project builds on the successful Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund Project developed under the GEF6 Resilient Food System program or Food Security IAP. With this experience, a successful replication and scaling up of the water fund model is expected. However, the issue of tax exemption for the Water Fund may undermine the long term sustainability of this financial mechanism. Please provide additional information on how this issue will be addressed during project implementation.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Further, the establishment of the endowment fund with investments coming from public and private sector entities is expected to be the main sustainability mechanism of the Fund. ELDOWAS will manage the endowment fund of the project in perpetuity. Being a government institution that is allowed to enjoy some tax exemptions, it is expected that savings made from these exemptions will be ploughed back into the endowment fund. This will be guaranteed during implementation by virtue of ELDOWAS managing the endowment fund in the long term. ELDOWAS has committed to contribute 100,000 USD annually towards the endowment fund in perpetuity, from among other sources, tax exemption. The smooth management of the endowment fund will be enhanced through a board of trustees identified during implementation, and represented by various public and private sector entities as in the case of the UNWFP.

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

4-16-19

1. While the PAs have been identified, it is not possible to visualize the target watersheds where there PAs are located. Please provide the approximate size of the watersheds.

2. The GEFSEC did not find the map mentioned in the text. The GEFSEC would need a map with the three selected landscapes to figure out the coherence between the proposed approach and the results (SLM and FLR in agriculture and forest lands in counties of Kiambu, Kwale, Uasin, and Gishu, Aberdare national park, Cherangani Hills forests reserves, Shimba Hills). Without mapped information, it is difficult to agree on the approach and the selected landscapes.

12-8-21: Geo-referenced maps of project areas are satisfactory.

Agency Response

1)

Please refer to the maps that are now provided in Annex A

2)

Please refer to the maps that are now provided in Annex A

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

12-8-21: The SECAP Review Note (Annex 6) mentions that "The project will undertake an FPIC and develop an indigenous peoples action plan to guide their involvement and active participation in beneficial project activities" and also indicate that an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESAMP) will be developed later. Please provide additional information and clarify why these essential safeguards documents were not prepared during the PPG phase. Please also note that the SECAP document is not signed.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

The ESMP and the FPIC instruments will be finalised during the initial phases of project implementation. They were not done earlier prior to this submission due to restricted movement and community consultations limitations brought about by the COVID pandemic. For the FPIC, the initial consultations and community engagements were done with indigenous peoples' leaders and community members during the design stages of the project. Further, a team was contracted by TNC to undertake the initial stages of the FPIC but were not able to do much due to the COVID 19 restrictions and low levels of vaccination among different stakeholders. The situation is much better now and movement is allowed while vaccination rates are much higher than before. It is anticipated that these studies will be completed prior to project commencement this year.

The FPIC document is expected to be signed by the representatives of the IPs. However, the revised SECAP review note that is attached is not signed as this is not part of the procedure in IFAD. Any legally binding clauses from the SECAP are included in the Financing Agreement with the Government of Kenya and this is what will be signed.

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

12-8-21: The project includes gender-responsive activities and gender-sensitive indicators. It is also well noted that the project has considered and taken into account

important gender dimensions. Please provide more information and upload the gender analysis conducted during the PPG process.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

A desktop gender analysis based on available literature was undertaken during the design as part of the development of the SECAP review note and some aspects of it are also captured in this design package (CEO endorsement, PIM etc.) A more systematic gender analysis is planned for the initial implementation stage of the project, as part of the baseline study and will also assess the status of the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI). WEAI measures the roles and extent of women's engagement in agriculture through 5 key variables: decisions about agricultural production; access to and decision making power over productive resources; control over use of income; leadership in the community, and time use/ work load reduction. It also measures women's empowerment relative to men within their households. The desktop analysis revealed that there are systematic gender and youth issues that will require to be addressed in consultation with county governments and local communities during implementation. Table 5 of the CEO endorsement identifies some of the priority areas that will be included in the analysis and action plan.

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

12-8-21: Elaboration on private sector engagement is adequate.

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

12-13-21: Several risk assessments were undertaken during the design of the EIWF project and are presented in different annexes of the package. In relation to the COVID-19 pandemic, the risk analysis only contemplates potential delays,

we recommend further elaboration of this session as per the GEF guidance note to reflect a more comprehensive risk analysis. Also, please, elaborate on the safeguards risks and mitigation and provide evidence of consultation with local communities and proposed grievance redress mechanisms at different project levels.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Additional sections on the COVID 19 pandemic and grievance redress mechanisms have been added in the ProDOC and the SECAP review note

Some reports on consultations held with communities have been attached. Please also see [this link](https://tnc.box.com/s/23cwxkgy1cwkfedjzjdrnjyuvjph793c) for further documentation

The GRM will be included in the ESMP to be finalised during the initial implementation phases of the project.

A comprehensive GRM will be developed in the initial stages of project implementation. As of now, there is no document on the project's grievance redress mechanism (GRM) as it is planned that this will be prepared as part of the project's ESMP and also aligned with existing local GRMs. The GRM will be aligned with IFAD's SECAP standards on the development of GRMs. Nevertheless, the project will also embed county level GRMs into the project's GRM. By law (as provided for under sections 87 (d), 88 and 89 of the County Governments Act, 2012); county governments are expected to develop grievance redress procedures. This entails establishing a county complaints handling mechanism, opportunities for public participation by all segments of society and feedback loops. The links below provide an example of sample county level GRMs, with a detailed one from one of the counties (Kiambu) attached in the annexes.

<https://elgeyomarakwet.go.ke/any-complaint-or-compliment/>

<https://maarifa.cog.go.ke/assets/file/a618dc04-kiambu-county-grievance-redress-mech.pdf>

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

12-13-21: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear indication of roles and responsibilities. The proposed public-private partnership mechanism is well described and builds up from previous experiences.

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

12-8-21: The proposed project is well aligned 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

12-13-21: Proposed knowledge management approach is adequate.

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

12-13-21: A Social Environment and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) Review Note was prepared in line with IFAD's guidelines on environment and social safeguards as well as climate risk analysis and management within IFAD funded or managed projects (Annex 6). Please see and address the comments made above regarding

evidence of stakeholders consultation (particularly FPIC), preparation of Environmental and Social Management Plans and the associated risk mitigation measures.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Community engagement for FPIC was done during design. Please see a link to the reports. <https://tnc.box.com/s/jul8n0e4zaaaau5wl5uyn804ikofx345>. Some reports on meetings and consultations held with IPs and their leaders during the design process as part of the annexes have also been attached.

The environmental and social impact assessment and its environment and social management plan (ESMP) will be prepared during the initial implementation stage together with the baseline survey and disclosure made to IFAD and the GEF by December 2022. The SECAP review has a risk matrix that identifies potential environmental and social risks associated with the project and their mitigation actions.

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

12-13-21: Project includes adequate M&E plan with specific budget. Please note that the M&E officer is currently budgeted under the technical components. Please revise.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

The budget has been reworked to clarify this

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

12-13-21: Socioeconomic benefits and GEBs are adequately described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-13-21: Budget: Please consider the following observations:

- o The M&E Officer is budgeted on technical components, and not only the M&E component. Please clarify.
- o Two drivers are budgeted. Please, provide additional information on how many vehicles, and potentially more drivers will be covered by co-financing resources.
- o Two project field officers are budgeted under the technical components. Please provide an outline of the Terms of Reference for such positions.

Protected Areas (PAs): The project mentions activities in 10 PAs covering 85,138 ha, and the project document indicates that "the project will work closely with the Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA), Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and Kenya Forest Service (KFS) to build capacities and implement the management effectiveness-tracking tool (METT) toolbox?". Please provide an annex with the baseline information for the METT of the PAs supported by the project.

04-28-22: Please provide responses to the following comments on Budget table:

- (i) Project Manager and Project assistant technical specialist/procurement specialist are charged to components and PMC. 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. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. As the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is expected to increase up to 1.2 million (see comment 1 above), and considering that the grants portion of co-financing are 1.6 million, there is room to cover some portion of the costs of the Project Manager and Project assistant technical specialist/procurement specialist from co-financing. Please revise.
- (ii) PMC operational costs are charged to component 2 and PMC. Please revise.
- (iii) Please provide justification for proposed purchase of motorbikes with GEF funds.

06-02-22: PMC remains the same with dis-proportionate allocation between GEF funding and co-financing. The response is not clear when it is mentioned that "*The issue*

of proportionality has been taken into account to ensure it's reasonable for both the project and co-financing?, but the GEF guidelines are not followed in respect to the proportionality of allocation of project management costs. Please, revise and amend.

The budget table under Annex E is a combined budget of both GEF funding and co-financing. Please we need for you to upload here only the GEF budget table. Also, it seems that the same positions of Project Manager and Project assistant technical specialist/procurement specialist keeps being charged to both project components and PMC, without increasing GEF-funded PMC and co-financed PMC as related to the comment above

Agency Response

21 April 2022

The Terms of Reference of the field officers have been prepared and attached to the PIM. Please see attached too.

Terms of Reference in Link: <https://tnc.box.com/s/aoe9coa5dhyjr93ilr5o3cn0jlaola2q>

The M&E officer is now only budgeted under M&E costs and the two drivers have been removed, meaning that the GEF will not finance these positions as TNC has committed to provide for this.

The METT is provided using initial estimates. The tool will be updated as part of the baseline survey. This should be complete and by December 2022

27 May 2022

The project proponent considered this opportunity and concluded that it is best to be as factual as possible. Only where the mentioned staff will undertake direct activities in components has this been budgeted under components.

The budget for PMC could take a bit more of the salaries but it will still be inadequate to cover all for the mentioned staff so we recommend to retain the factual allocation so that we also track it during implementation through time-sheet records.

The issue of proportionality has been taken into account to ensure it's reasonable for both the project and co-financing.

(ii) The proponents have confirmed that operational costs are charged to PMC except in instances where staff is involved in direct implementation of activities e.g. Oversighting quality of tree nursery, seedlings, their delivery, recording of beneficiary details and verifying that data provided from the field is accurate.

(iii). Motorbikes need: The project will be implemented across two Counties in Kenya i.e. Uasin Gishu and Elgeyo Marakwet. These are vast and hilly areas and some of them without very well developed all weather roads. While there exists some public transport systems mainly minibuses, their movement is dictated by availability of passengers other than time scheduling. Having motorbikes for the four county extension assistants will enable them plan their time, and travel reasonable distances within the project area. This is even more critical given the high target for communities to be reached and supported as well as forest-based conservation work.

The planning has taken into consideration that fact the motorbikes are more fuel efficient and cost less to operate. Proponent will ensure staff have requisite riding skills before being assigned motorbikes.

2 June 2022

addressed

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-13-21: Proposal includes adequate results framework.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-17-21: Please address the comments above and resubmit for further review. Thanks!

04-28-22: Please address the comments above and resubmit. Thanks!

02-06-22: Please, address the budget related comments above. Given tomorrow's deadline for CEO Endorsement I highly recommend that you send a letter signed by the OFP request extension of the CEO endorsement deadline invoking ?force majeure? (COVID) urgently. Thanks!

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Please see the review sheet, CEO endorsement and other attachments provided

27 May 2022

Comments have been addressed

2 June 2022

addressed

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-8-21: Status of PPG utilization has been satisfactorily reported.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-8-21: Maps are adequate.

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

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations