

Enhancing capacity for the adoption and implementation of EAF in the shrimp and groundfish fisheries of the North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (EAf4SG)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10919

Countries

Regional (Guyana, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)

Project Name

Enhancing capacity for the adoption and implementation of EAF in the shrimp and groundfish fisheries of the North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (EAf4SG)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/16/2022

Review completed by PM

12/5/2022

Program Manager

Andrew Hume

Focal Area

International Waters

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
ahume (12/5/22): Yes.

Agency Response N/A
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
ahume (12/5/22): Partly. Many of the outputs in Table B read as outcomes. For example, Output 1.1.3: and Output 1.1.4: both just say "improved", which is what Outcome 1.1 states. Please revise to articulate specific outputs, such as what specifically (and quantifiably) will be done to make these improvements.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response Modifications have been made to several outputs to address the comment. Namely: in Component 1 (1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4); Component 2 (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.3.1); and Component 3 (3.1.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2). The same changes have been reported in the results framework, and throughout the CEO Endorsement Request, the FAO ProDoc, and in the relevant annexes.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response N/A

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 ahume (12/5/22): Yes, the co-financing is adequately documented and supporting evidence provided.

Agency Response N/A

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 ahume (12/5/22): Yes

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Please provide details on the activities funded through the PPG instead of having a broad subject lines like ?consultants?.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response The detailed PPG budget has been included in the submission.

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes there were changes in core indicator targets. Core Indicator 8 (fisheries) was reduced by 2,000 mt. The justification for this reduction is sound. There are no other changes in core indicator targets since PIF. The indicator explanations are justified and realistic.

However, please also note the following with respect to the Core Indicators and the Results Framework:

- a. Please request agency to include the target for core indicators 7 and 8 in the results framework (annex A). GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.
- b. The target for core indicator 11 in the core indicator table does not match with the results framework (annex A).

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

- a. The targets for Core indicators (CI) CI 7, 8 and 11 are now included in the results framework (Annex A). For CI 7 only the final target is given since the project is being conducted in only one LME. A mid-term target is not applicable for CI 7 [Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management.]

b. CI 11 was made consistent across the entire submission. The source of information for CI 11 was given in the original version (the targets for CI 11 are based on the CRFM statistics and not on the number of beneficiaries specific to Component 3).

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, the global environmental problems specific to the project are well articulated.

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, there is a sufficient elaboration of project baseline, including past and ongoing CLME related GEF investments. However, many of the cofinancing partners providing letters are not specifically identified. For example, what is the baseline provided by the Surinaamse Seafood Associate, the Guyana National Fisherfolk Organization, Moruga La Ruffin Fishing Cooperative, Claxton Bay Fishing Association, or Future Fishers, Trinidad and Tobago? It's wonderful to see these partners participating, but beyond their letters of cofinancing, they are not mentioned in the baseline (nor elsewhere in the CEO End document). Please elaborate on their baseline efforts as demonstrated with their cofinancing support.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response Some of the co-financiers are mentioned in the original baseline, e.g., Guyana Association of Trawler Owners and Seafood Processors (GATOSP) and CeDePesca (Suriname). Additional information has been inserted in the baseline to highlight the activities and involvement of all the fisheries sector co-financiers in areas (such as data collection, co-management and EAF implementation) that are relevant to the project's objectives. The incremental reasoning section was also elaborated with a brief description of how the GEF support will strengthen the capacity of these co-financing partners for EAF management.

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

ahume (12/5/22): Partly. As noted above, many of the outputs needs to be revised to read as outputs and not outcomes.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response This comment has been addressed, as described above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): No. The text in this section is identical from PIF. Please elaboration based on input from stakeholder consultation. Please also revise references of the project contributing to BD focal area objectives, instead note the project's alignment.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response The description of the project's alignment with the IW (and BD) focal areas strategies has been elaborated to more clearly illustrate this alignment (no core indicators for biodiversity are included however). Also mentioned is the concern by national stakeholders about the overfished status of the shrimp and groundfish stocks and demersal fisheries impacts on the marine ecosystem and biodiversity, which have partly influenced the selection of the fisheries to be targeted by the project. In addition to the project's alignment with IW objective and strategic actions, the text has been modified to highlight the project's contribution to strengthening transboundary cooperation among the three countries in the sustainable management of the NBSLME and its shared living marine resources as well as its support for implementation of strategies and actions of the CLME+ SAP (e.g., through promoting investments that support SAP implementation, which is a key GEF priority within the IW Focal Area).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): Yes. The ICR section provides a good summary of the GEF justification.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): No. The articulation of GEB remains identical since PIF. Please elaborate based on input from stakeholder engagement.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response Stakeholder engagement did not yield additional inputs. The text was elaborated to include more details on the project's contribution to GEB (including reduced impacts on several non-target species) and adaptation benefits. In addition, the text was updated based on the recently endorsed CBD's Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework).

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes

Agency Response N/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

ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, a summary of stakeholders engaged and stakeholder engagement plan has been provided.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, a gender analysis has been completed and gender responsive activities have been proposed.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, private sector engagement is well articulated. The main role of the private sector is via fisherfolk as a key project stakeholder.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, a risk matrix has been provided that summarizes with proposed mitigation measures the key project risks, including related to COVID.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): No. It is unclear what is being proposed in terms of sharing the PMU with a future project as noted in Table 4 and this sentence: "The PMU and KMC specialist are likely to be shared with the FAO-GEF REBYC III CLME+ project to ensure maximum synergies, collaboration and optimization of resources allocated to project coordination, knowledge management and communication.". It is unclear which specific positions within the PMU this is referring to. This future REBYC III project as not yet identified an executing agency @ PIF, nor has it been submitted or approved at CEO Endorsement, so the PMUs for these two projects should be designed independently.

It is also noted that the Regional Coordinator position in the budget financed from outside the PMC. This position needs to be fully financed under the PMC.

Please also revise Table 4 in the Portal so that the text is legible.

1/23/23 (ahume): Partly addressed. The Regional Coordinator position is still budgeted from technical components and PMC. The Agency has provided a justification for keeping the position jointly funded by PMC and project components. After reviewing the TORs for the Technical and Regional Coordinator, many of the technical tasks are considered project management. This needs to be reflected by increasing the PMC allocation for this position such that it is the majority of funding. Further, to better understand the justification, please also provide a table that maps all the positions tasks in the TOR to the components and PMC. Lastly, as the PMU is jointly shared with a project that is not yet submitted, the other project

(REBYC III) will need to be submitted to complete the understand the PMU being proposed in this project. Please submit this project asap to expedite the review of this project

4/7/2023 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

ToRs for Technical and Project Coordinator in the two Project Documents (EAF4SG and REBYC III) have been revised to delineate better the technical tasks that will be conducted by this key staff member responsible for overall management of the two projects. The new ToR clearly splits project management and technical tasks, with clearer and more detail descriptions of the technical tasks for the Technical and Project Coordinator.

The rationale for the allocation of costs of the Technical and Project Coordinator is that UWI accepted to execute two highly complex GEF projects with a joint PMU comprised of 4 staff, one of them part-time arrangements (M&E officer). A number of discussions were held with senior UWI staff and it was agreed that this arrangement ? having a joint PMU and a Technical and Project Coordinator with both PMU and technical tasks was the most efficient, cost-effective way to use the limited GEF resources available for project management. UWI were being very generous in their offer to act as executing partner and are providing significant co-financing to support this (combined USD 1,340,000 for the two projects, mostly to support the PMU). This being said, considering the size of the two PMC allocations, there is no room to allocate more costs than what it is presented right now. Nevertheless, looking at the new aggregated table attached in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section of the two project documents, we can see that the cost of the Technical and Project Coordinator is allocated 62% on technical task and 38% on PMC. Kindly note that many other IW projects have recently been approved with a higher difference between the technical and PMC costs for their project coordinators (for example, GEF ID 10520 and GEF IS 10712). Finally, we would also like to mention that there is no GEF policy indicating a mandatory 50-50 allocation of costs for technical vs. managerial tasks, as far as the technical tasks of the staff are duly explained in the ToRs attached to the submission (as we have done in Annex N attached both in the agency ProDoc and as standalone annex in the roadmap of the submission).

A table showing the allocation of resources for the PMU that will support the execution of the EAF4SG and REBYCIII projects has been added to the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination sections of the two Project Documents and CEO endorsement requests. The

table also indicates the costs being allocated from each project (and the total cost) per position.

The titles of each position have been checked and made consistent in the two projects. These are: 1) Technical and Project Coordinator, 2) Administration and Operations Support Officer, 3) Knowledge Management and Communication Officer, and 4) Part Time M and E Support Officer.

- Additional text has been added to 6. Institutional Arrangements and Coordination

This explains that the PIF of EAF4SG was developed in parallel with that of GEF 10857 REBYC III. The two projects share the same countries (except for Barbados) and several key strategies such those for gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and communication strategies. For this reason, at the PIF stage (2022) it was agreed with the GEFSEC Task Manager to execute the two projects with a cost-shared PMU. This would ensure maximum synergies, collaboration and optimization of resources allocated, avoiding at the same time duplication of costs. In terms of timeline, it is important to notice that the CEO Endorsement Request for the GEF 10857 REBYC III will be submitted by the end of the first week of February 2023 the latest. This should allow synchronizing the execution of the two projects supervised, as explained above, by the same PMU.

- The Technical and Project Coordinator will mainly execute technical tasks, assuring at the same time management support. The first will be covered by the funds allocated under the project's components, as detailed in Annex N: Draft TOR for Main Project Management Unit Staff and key consultants (this file is available in both the FAO ProDoc and as a stand-alone file in the roadmap of the submission). The management task will be covered by the PMC. It is important noticing that two projects will be managed by the same PMU made of 4 staff covered by the GEF. In parallel, UWI will make available its administrative and financial structure to support the project. This contribution has been reported in the co-financing letter of UWI as IN-KIND for: a) M and E support Officer \$10,000.00; b) BDU FFA Staff Salaries (Administrative) \$79,000.00; and c) BDU FFA Staff (Managerial) \$320,000.00. These resources together with those allocated by the GEF should ensure a proper support to the two projects, instrumental for a timely and efficient execution of the activities.

- Table 4 has been replaced in the portal. Please let us know if it is readable now.

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

ahume (12/5/22): No, the regional level rationale is okay, but please provide more detail on how the project is supporting specific Guyana, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago's national level strategies and plans relevant to the project.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

The text on consistency with national priorities has been elaborated with more details including on national development plans and strategies, national fisheries management plans, and NBSAP of each country.

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, KM is adequately described.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, ESS adequately documented.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, though it is noted the budget in Table 6 (\$101k) differs from the project budget excel table (\$49k). Please address this inconsistency.

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response The M&E budget in Table 6 and the M&E allocation in the project budget are now consistent. Both are set to USD 101,000

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

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, socio-economic benefits are well documented.

Agency Response

N/A

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): Yes, all annexes are included. But please address the below:

Annex A: See RF comments below

Annex B: N/A

Annex C: See comments above on PPG

Annex D: No comments.

Annex E: Please see: a) Comments on Regional Coordinator comment under Institutional Arrangements; b) Comments on M&E budget mismatch from M&E review question.

Please also be sure Annex E in portal that table fits within the portal margins so that when the project documents are downloaded the contain all the information. Table 1 and Table 4 in portal also exceed margins. Please check all portal tables.

Additionally on Budget, please address the following:

A. Project Coordinators are being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution should be charged to the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? this includes the project's staff. With 400K represented in grants, there may be room to cover the project's staff.

B. Under 5024 Expendable Procurement and 5025 Non-Expendable Procurement: Support to a country is an ineligible expense. Please remove these items.

C. Please include a column for all M&E expenses, similar to the budget template provided in the operational guidelines.

Annex F: N/A

Annex G: N/A

Annex H: N/A

1/23/23 (ahume): Partly addressed. For ANNEX E: Project Budget Table, as noted in comment above, the Regional Coordinator position is still budgeted from technical components and PMC. The Agency has provided a justification for keeping the position jointly funded by PMC and project components. After reviewing the TORs for the Technical and Regional Coordinator, many of the technical tasks are considered project management. This needs to be reflected by increasing the PMC allocation for this position such that it is the majority of funding. Further, to better understand the justification, please also provide a table that maps all the positions tasks in the TOR to the components and PMC. Lastly, as the PMU is jointly shared with a project that is not yet submitted, the other project (REBYC III) will need to be submitted to complete the understand the PMU being proposed in this project. Please submit this project asap to expedite the review of this project

4/7/2023 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

See the response above

Annex A: all comments made by GEF SEC has been addressed

Annex B: N/A

Annex C: a new detailed PPG budget was included

Annex D: No comments.

Annex E: all comments made by GEF SEC has been addressed.

The figure of the budget has been resized and uploaded again. The same applies to Table 1 and 4. Please let us know if now they fit in the margins.

It was explained above why the Technical and Project Coordinator is charged on both PMC and technical components and that the USD 161K also partially covers for the admin and financial support at UWI, a part-time M&E, Auditing Costs and other costs who must be allocated under PMC by GEF rules.

Kindly note that the USD 215K grant co-fin committed by the Fisheries Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Government of the Republic of Suriname, and the USD 185K cash co-fin committed by the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) are funds that are funds included in the budgets of these two organizations which will cover technical activities contributing to the success of the project. This is duly explained in the co-financing letters of the two organizations. These funds cannot be used to pay staff hosted by the executing agency (UWI) because this is not allowed by the financial regulation of the countries.

Moreover, UWI will support the execution of EAF4SG with in-kind contributions such as: M and E support Officer \$ 10,000.00; BDU FFA Staff Salaries (Administrative); \$ 79,000.00 BDU FFA Staff (Managerial); \$ 320,000.00 Office supplies and consumables (paper and other supplies); \$ 18,000.00 Office supplies and consumables (Computers, Printers, etc.); \$ 30,000.00 Office Premises; \$ 82,000.00 Training, Workshop and Meeting Venue; \$ 50,000.00 Equipment Maintenance; \$ 50,000.00 Reporting; \$ 20,000.00 Communications (tel, fax, e-mail, etc.); \$ 80,000.00 Utilities. These contributions have been duly reported as in-kind co-financing by UWI in their co-financing letter.

Budget lines under 5024 Expendable Procurement and 5025 have been re-organized and explained better to make understandable these are eligible costs related to the project activities in the countries (this is what we meant with support to...)

A M&E column is now visible in the budget under Outcome 4.2 (101k entirely dedicated to M&E)

Annex F: N/A

Annex G: N/A

Annex H: N/A

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): Please address the following:

- 1) It's unclear why 2,000,000 ha is the mid-way target for Objective 1? Is this based on any specific assumptions related to inshore fishing areas identified by the GEF Core Indicator target rationale?
- 2) There are question marks (?) in Outcome 2.1
- 3) It is not obvious how the RF will track project progress towards GEF Core Indicator 8: (Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels).
- 4) Why is the final target for RF Indicator 8 (Number of harmonized management technical measures) 2 and not 3 for one for each country?

Please also note the following with respect to the Core Indicators and the Results Framework:

- a. Please include the target for core indicators 7 and 8 in the results framework (annex A). GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.
- b. The target for core indicator 11 in the core indicator table does not match with the results framework (annex A).

1/23/23 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

It is assumed that roughly 1/3 of fishing areas will be under improved management. This is approximate and results from the expected review and approval of Guyana FMP by mid-term.

The question marks (?) in Outcome 2.1 has been removed.

It is presumed that the adoption of EAF will help move fisheries towards more sustainable levels. Basically, the means of verification would be the stock assessment results for relevant species (catch will be known/estimated for these) and the resulting measures adopted at national and sub-regional levels.

This is a safeguard as the indicator calls for adoption of harmonized measures, which is always risky.

Core Indicators 7, 8 and 11 are now included in the RF.

There seems to be a misunderstanding between global beneficiaries (12,000, now included in the RF) and the number of beneficiaries from Component 3 (Outcome 3.1. Indicator 12) which is very specific for business opportunities. Core indicator 11 has now been included in the RF.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response N/A

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): No GEF Council comments provided

Agency Response N/A

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): No STAP comments provided

Agency Response N/A

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): No Convention comments provided

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): No Agency comments provided

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): No CSO comments provided

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): Please address PPG comments above.

Agency Response A new detailed PPG budget table was included.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request ahume (12/5/22): Yes.

Agency Response N/A

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

ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response

N/A

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 ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response N/A

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 ahume (12/5/22): N/A

Agency Response N/A

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ahume (12/5/22): No. Please address the above comments

1/25/23 (ahume): Please address remaining comments and resubmit.

4/7/2023 (ahume): The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/25/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/11/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations