

Strengthening the capacity of the Republic of Tajikistan to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10967

Countries

Tajikistan

Project Name

Strengthening the capacity of the Republic of Tajikistan to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement.

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

1/25/2023

Review completed by PM

2/13/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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 4/6/2023:

1. Cleared.

EBF 3/28/2023:

1. The new completion date (2/28/2026) takes place before the expected implementation start date. Please correct and make sure that these dates are congruent with the project duration.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. As shown in the screen capture below, it seems there is an error in the duration of the project. The expected implementation and completion date do not match with the duration of the project. Please review and correct where

necessary.

Submission Date 4/8/2022	Expected Implementation Start 5/1/2023	Expected Completion Date 2/28/2026
Duration ⓘ 36 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 125,387.00

Agency Response

4/4/2023: Thank you for the pointer. It is corrected.

22/03/2023: Thanks for the review comment. The dates are corrected

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 3/2/2023:

Yes, this has been provided and the project design is appropriate.

Agency Response

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 3/2/2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
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 3/2/2023:

Yes, this is a cost-effective approach. Although the amounts allocated for components have slightly changed compared to the PIF, the total project cost remains the same.

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
EBF 4/12/2023:

1. Cleared.

EBF 4/11/2023:

1. Although you fixed the previous error, the sum of the subtotals (\$49,920) doesn't match the total PPG amount (\$50,000). Please review the table again and ensure the rows and columns add up.

EBF 4/6/2023:

1. Thank you for the correction. However, the column corresponding to the "Unspent amounts" now adds to \$2,105 instead of \$2,185. Please review and address so that the figures and the subtotals are correct.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 50,000					
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)				
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent to date on PPG account*	Amount Committed on PPG account	Back charges to be issued	The Unspent Amounts
Admin and Finance Officer	3,000	0	0	3,000	0
Adaptation specialist	8,100	7,040	1,133	0	-73
GEF Project Design Expert	18,000	0	0	18,700	-700
National ETF Specialist	8,100	0	9,393	0	-1,293
Contracts (Capacity Assessment)	4,300	0	4,420	0	-200
Training and workshops	8,500	0	4,129	0	4,371
Total	50,000	7,040	19,075	21,700	2,185

EBF 3/28/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the changes to the Table in Annex C. However, the text at the beginning of Annex C ("* It should be noted that an additional USD 31,052 has been spent...") doesn't coincide with the figures shown in the table or is difficult to understand. Please include the \$31,052 in the table, review the text and adjust accordingly.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comments related to Annex C:

1. Please use rounded numbers (without decimals).
2. Please clarify how much has been unspent (you can include an additional column). Based on the information you have provided, there is an unspent balance of \$2,597.99 (\$50,000 - \$6,377.97 - \$9,972.04 - \$31,052)
3. We acknowledge your note in Annex C, which explains *"that an additional \$31,052 has been spent for the preparation of the project document and will be charged backed to the PPG account, following the completion of FAO's internal accounting"*

procedures."

Please include the \$31,052 in the table.

4. As a kind reminder, you can find below a table of ineligible expenditures under the PPG:

Table 2. Ineligible expenditures under Project Preparation Grants (PPGs)

- Costs associated with the work of government staff or regular project/program activities of the GEF Agency or a Project Executing Entity (EA).
- Non-project preparation costs including: **project start-up costs** (i.e. costs covered by Agency such as pipeline management, operationalization of the project, internal appraisal, or covered by the project budget); demonstration and pilot projects; implementation of large-scale enabling activities, including detailed country-wide inventories and country studies, training activities other than where they are directly related to project and/or country preparation; major research.
- Capital goods (e.g. computers and engineering equipment) other than those directly related to project preparation,.
- Purchase of motorized vehicles (such purchase, if required, should instead be covered by other financing amounts, not **PPG**).

Agency Response

12/04/2023 - Apologies for the repeated discrepancies. The figures in Annex C regarding the PPG funds utilization are corrected and double checked. All sums and amounts are consistent and reflect the level of actual expenses as of today.

7/4 2023 - Addressed, with our apologies for the oversight.

4/4/2023: Thank you for the pointer. The amount of back-charges to be applied to the project is corrected on the text at the beginning to USD 21,700; which is also the amount included in the table that is presented in the Annex C regarding the PPG expenses.

22/03/2023: Thanks for the review comments. Expenditure and commitment numbers are rounded up and back-charges to be applied as well as the remaining amounts are indicated in separate columns, as requested.

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 3/2/2023:

The people benefiting from GEF-financed investments (Indicator 11) remain the same compared to the PIF, and an explanation is provided on how these numbers were calculated.
Cleared.

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 3/2/2023:

Yes, this has been provided. Cleared.

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
EBF 3/28/2023:

1. Thank you for the summaries. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comments:

1. We thank you for the detailed information and tables provided in this section. We would appreciate it if you could provide a paragraph summarizing what is relevant to the project and the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency. This would allow to understand why the alternative scenario (with the project's intervention) would be relevant. For example, you could include a paragraph after Table 9 and Figure 9 (before paragraph 62) to briefly explain the current institutional framework and

workflow relevant to the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Tajikistan? You could do something similar after Table 11.

2. Please clarify what are the four national documents referred to in paragraph 66.

Agency Response

1. Based on review comment, summary is added after Figure 9 and Table 11 and marked with green color (Paragraph #63 & 66).

2. Thanks for the review comment. Please note that four was a typo. It is deleted now. This section is now paragraph #69.

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 3/28/2023:

1. Thank you for including the Activities in Table B. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023

Please address the following comments:

1. We note that project Activities are not mentioned in the portal version of the CEO Approval document. They were mentioned in Table B of the PIF document and are referred to in different sections of the CEO Approval document (such as Table 7). Please include the project Activities in the portal version of the CEO Approval document (either in Table B or the proposed alternative scenario section) and make sure that the text provided in the proposed alternative scenario section is adequate.
2. The text in the portal version of the proposed alternative scenario section provides a broad sense of what is intended for each component. However, it needs to accurately describe how the alternative scenario will be accomplished. Please review this section and be more specific.

Agency Response

1. Thanks for the review comment. The activities are added on Table B.

2. Based on the review comment, proposed alternative scenario section is now updated and highlighted with green color. Please see paragraphs #73, 78 and 82.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/2/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/2/2023: 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

EBF 3/2/2023: 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

EBF 3/2/2023: Yes.

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 3/2/2023: 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

EBF 3/28/2023:

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. Please clarify if private sector representatives were engaged during the inception and validation workshops. Paragraph 89 lists several private companies which are not mentioned in Table 15.

Agency Response

1. Thanks for the review comment. It is clarified in the text that the relevant private sector stakeholders have been identified during the PPG phase and the attempts to outreach for raising their awareness about the project has been initiated. The Barki Tojik Energy Company representatives have also attended the inception and validation workshops.

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 3/28/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. (Regarding paragraph 12) Table 15 and 16 refer to the stakeholder's consultation, not to gender equality and women's empowerment per se. Please elaborate how will the project address gender consideration in national policies, program and projects
2. Please incorporate gender indicators and gender-sensitive data in Component 3. For Components 1 and 2, please ensure the inclusion of gender experts (including from the government) and representatives of women's organizations among the stakeholders to be consulted and engaged.

Agency Response

1. Thanks for the review comment. Kindly note that the reference to table numbers is corrected. Gender policy analysis (Tables 20 and 21) and Gender Action Plan (Tables 22 and 23) are uploaded as attached documents under the 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment' section.

2. Indicator (iii)(b) under Output 3.1.1 and Indicator (v)(b) under Output 3.1.2 are added. Women experts' and women's group representatives' participation are included as requirements under relevant activities under the other components.

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 3/28/2023:

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. Is the private sector expected to participate or benefit from a specific project output or activity? If so, please elaborate.

Agency Response [Thanks for the review comment. Based on the review comment, expected benefits to private sector from project activities are added in paragraph #122 and marked in green color.](#)

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 3/2/2023: Yes, this has been elaborated and we note the mention of COVID19-related risks. Please elaborate briefly on COVID19-related opportunities that may arise.

Agency Response [Thanks for the review comment. Based on review comment, COVID19-related opportunities briefly added in paragraph #126 and marked in green color.](#)

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 3/2/2023: Yes, this has been provided.

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 3/2/2023: Yes, this has been provided.

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 3/28/2023:

1. Noted. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. Please clarify if the data and information management system for ETF to be developed under Component 3 will contribute to knowledge management. If so, please elaborate.

Agency Response Thanks for the review comment. Based on the review comment, additional elaboration on utilizing the data and information management system is added in paragraph #146 and marked with green color.

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 3/2/2023:

Yes, this has been marked as low. 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 3/28/2023:

1. Cleared.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. The M&E budget is on the higher side for this project. Please consider reducing the budget.

Agency Response Thanks for the review comment. Based on review comment, the M&E budget as well as the total budget is updated to appropriate changes, while keeping the total project GEF finance same as the original submission. The updated amount is highlighted with green color in Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Project Description Summary (Table B).

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 3/2/2023: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/11/2023: Cleared. Terms of reference for the National Project Coordinator/Technical Advisor are provided in Annex N and in the agency response below.

EBF 4/6/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Regarding the National Project Coordinator/Technical Advisor, we note that \$10,000 have been assigned from PMC, and the project components cover the rest (\$98,000). We couldn't find the Terms of Reference related to this position. Please provide the Terms of Reference and justify the responsibilities of this position based on its budget distribution.
3. Cleared.

EBF 3/28/2023:

1. We take note of the changes made to Annex A. The indicators highlighted in green are expressed in relative values. going back to our previous comment, can you please include an indicator related to core indicator 11 in absolute numbers (128 female, 192 men) or express these indicators highlighted in green in absolute numbers?
2. Regarding the comments related to Annex E:
 1. Cleared.
 2. Thank you for your comment, but we request you to address our previous comment. Several positions (Technical advisor, National M&E and KM Officer, Finance/Admin associate. and Operations/Project support Officer) are still being charged across components and the 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. When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). As per guidelines the financial specialist should be fully charged to the PMC. Please correct.

Description	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Total	Component 1:	Component 2:	Component 3:	M&E
5570 International Consultants & National Consultants								
GHG Inventory, ETF and MRV Specialist	days	90	500	45,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
Data Management and Information System specialist	days	60	500	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
Sub-total international Consultants				75,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
National consultants								
Technical Advisor	months	36	2,000	72,000	20,667	20,667	20,667	
National GHG inventory and MRV expert	months	20	1,500	30,000	-	15,000	15,000	
National data & Information Management System Digital Specialist	months	18	1,500	27,000	-	13,500	13,500	
National M&E and KM Officer	months	18	1,500	27,000	7,333	7,333	7,333	
Institutional Arrangement expert	months	12	1,500	18,000	18,000			
National Gender expert	months	15	1,500	22,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	
Finance/Admin Associate	months	30	1,500	45,000	7,500	7,500	7,500	
Operations/Project support Officer	months	36	2,000	72,000	15,637	15,637	15,637	
Sub-total national Consultants				313,500	76,637	87,137	87,137	
5570 Total consultants				388,500	101,637	112,137	112,137	
5650 Contracts								

3. Annex B is off margins, please fix it.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. Regarding Annex A, please include the core indicator 11 explicitly in the results framework.
2. Regarding Annex E:
 1. Please upload again the project budget since it is difficult to read.
 2. Also related to the budget, several positions (technical advisor, institutional arrangement expert, Finance/Admin associate/ operations officer) have been charged across components and the 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. When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 page 42 of the Guidelines). Please correct.

Description	Unit	No. of units	Component 1:	Component 2:	Component 3:	M&E	PMC	TOTAL GEF	Hydromet	Na
5570 International Consultants & National Consultants										
GHG Inventory, ETF and MRV Specialist	days	90	15,000	15,000	15,000	-	-	45,000	45,000	
Data Management and Information System specialist	days	60	10,000	10,000	10,000	-	-	30,000	30,000	
Sub-total International Consultants			25,000	25,000	25,000	-	-	75,000	75,000	
National consultants										
Technical Advisor	months	36	20,667	20,667	20,667	-	10,000	72,000	72,000	
National GHG inventory and MRV expert	months	20	-	15,000	15,000	-	-	30,000	30,000	
National data & Information Management System Digital Specialist	months	18	-	13,500	13,500	-	-	27,000	27,000	
National M&E and KM Officer	months	18	7,333	7,333	7,333	-	5,000	27,000	27,000	
Institutional Arrangement expert	months	12	18,000	-	-	-	-	18,000	18,000	
National Gender expert	months	15	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	-	22,500	22,500	
Finance/Admin Associate	months	30	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	22,500	45,000	45,000	
Operations/Project support Officer	months	36	15,637	15,637	15,637	-	25,088	72,000	72,000	

Table B - Execution Functions eligible for funding by the GEF portion of PMC¹⁰²

Staffing costs, including:

- Project manager;
- Project assistant technical specialist(s);
- Procurement specialist; and/or
- Financial specialist.

Project-related activities of Executing Entity, including:

- Preparation of procurement plans;
- Terms of reference and procurement packages;
- Management of consultant activities;
- Management of output deliverables;
- Maintenance of records of all project-related documentation
- Management and administration of the Knowledge Management Plan;
- Preparation of progress reports and financial reports for the project;
- Consultation with project stakeholders;
- Financial auditing for the project.

7/Apr/23

TOR of the Technical Advisor are provided in annex N. we are also copy pasting below for ease of reference. The National Project Director covered by co-financing will perform most of the managerial/coordination functions

National Project Coordinator/Technical Advisor

The NPC will lead the establishment of institutional coordination mechanisms and capacity development for monitoring and reporting of the climate change adaptation and financing processes. It will provide enhanced coordination and leadership for all technical aspects of the project, under the guidance of the LTO, on behalf of the NPD, and within the framework delineated by the PSC.

Key responsibilities

S/he will be responsible, among others, for:

- o Overall technical lead for the implementation of all project outputs and activities and ensure technical soundness of project implementation.
- o Coordination with relevant initiatives.
- o Lead technical implementation of key outputs
- o Ensuring a high level of collaboration among participating institutions and organizations at the national and local levels.
- o Coordination and close monitoring of the efforts for institutional coordination and climate change reporting.
- o Leading and supervising the preparation of various technical outputs, e.g. knowledge products, reports and case studies.
- o Ensuring meaningful engagement of stakeholders as per the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
- o Ensuring the achievement of project objectives as per the appropriate implementation of the approved work plan.
- o Providing technical support and assessing the outputs of the project national consultants hired with GEF funds, as well as the products generated in the implementation of the project.
- o Provide technical guidance and support to technical meetings and workshops.
- o Provide technical support to the assessment of MRV under the Convention, as well as under the Paris Agreement, in particular with respect to the requirements for the ETF in the related modalities and procedures, through their identification and assistance to PMU
- o Overseeing the progress of implementation and leading the preparation of implementation plan; identifying bottlenecks and proposing alternative solutions to achieve necessary results.
- o Submitting the six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPRs) with the AWP/B, to the PSC and FAO.
- o With support from the Knowledge Management and M&E Specialist, preparing the first draft of the Project Implementation Review (PIR).

- o Supporting the organization of the mid-term review and terminal evaluation in close coordination with the FAO Budget Holder and the FAO Independent Office of Evaluation (OED).
- o Providing draft terminal report for BH two months before the ending date of the project;
- o Informing the PSC and FAO of any delays and difficulties as they arise during the implementation to ensure timely corrective measure and support.

4/4/2023:

1) Thank you for your comment.. The number of women aimed to be included as beneficiaries are included as absolute numbers.

2.2) Thank you for your comment. Relevant Changes were made in the budget that was copied in the portal, but the latest version of the budget was not uploaded as a separate document, which will be uploaded now. Please refer to either refer to Annex A on the portal or the document titled "Budget_CBIT_Tajikistan_03 April 2023".

The National Project Coordinator/Technical Advisor will indeed have specific tasks to deliver under other project components with unique outputs linked to the respective components included in their Terms of Reference.

3) Thank you for the comment. The table is tightened to fit into the margins.

22/03/2023: 1. Thanks for the review comment. Based on the review comment, the value of the core indicator 11 is added in the results framework (Please see Annex A) and highlighted in green color as mentioned below to sum up to the total beneficiary number of 320 (please see the core indicator table).

Output 1.2.1 (ii)(b) 40

Output 2.1.1 (iii)(b) 40

Output 2.2.1 (i)(b) 40

Output 2.2.1 (ii)(b) 40

Output 2.2.1 (iii)(b) 40

Output 2.3.1 (iii)(b) 40

Output 3.1.1 (iii)(b) 40Output 3.1.2 (v)(b) 40

2.1. The budget is uploaded again.

2.2. Allocation of the full cost of ?Finance/Admin Associate? is corrected to under the PMC column.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/28/2023: Please refer to the previous comment related to Annex A.

EBF 3/2/2023:

Please address the following comment:

1. Regarding Annex A, we recommend replacing the following indicators (v) and (vi) of Output 1.1.1 with indicators based on the SMART approach (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound):
 1. Indicators (v) and (vi) of Output 1.1.1
 2. Indicator (i) of Output 1.2.1
 3. Indicator (ii) and (iii) of Output 3.1.2

Agency Response

3/04/2023: Thank you for your comment. The number of women aimed to be included as beneficiaries are included as absolute numbers in the results framework table (Annex A).

22/03/2023: Thanks for the review comment. Based on the review comment, following indicators are updated, and highlighted with green color. Please see the Annex A.

1. Indicators (v) and (vi) of Output 1.1.1
2. Indicator (i) of Output 1.2.1
3. Indicator (ii) and (iii) of Output 3.1.2

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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 3/2/2023: Please refer to the comment above related to PPG utilization.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 3/2/2023: Yes, this has been provided.

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 4/12/2023: The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Approval.

EBF 4/11/2023: Please address the comment above, highlighted in **blue**, related to Annex C.

EBF 4/6/2023: Please address the comments above.

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

EBF 3/28/2023: Please address the comments above.

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

EBF 3/2/2023: Please address the comments above.

** Please highlight in green 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
First Review	3/2/2023	3/23/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2023	4/4/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/6/2023	4/7/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/11/2023	4/12/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/12/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations