



Strengthening the System of Protected Areas and Improvement of its Financial Sustainability

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11449

Countries

Paraguay

Project Name

Strengthening the System of Protected Areas and Improvement of its Financial Sustainability

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

10/19/2023

Review completed by PM

11/28/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

The project does not align with the LD FA strategy. Please see comments later in the review sheet for revisions required on this aspect.

Other than that, cleared.

11/28/2023

Please see comments below and make the corrections requested.

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

Corrections have been made to the financing tables following feedback from PM.

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

The reason the project is not aligned with the LD FA Strategy is because Paraguay, which is fully Flexible in the use of its STAR, decided to utilize all remaining BD, CC and LD financial resources for a BD project.

Since the BD funds were partially utilized and we could not validate the submission in the portal, we therefore used the LD and CC allocation to ensure submission. The portal does not allow allocating all resources under BD because the total project amount was more than the remaining BD STAR allocation.?

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared. Please note comments in Indicators section on the missing targets for CI 6.

11/28/2023

Any project that is maintaining vegetative cover as a result of the project intervention, such as a protected area project that will improve management of protected areas such as this project proposes to do, has a mitigation benefit, hence it should use CI 6. Revise accordingly and include estimates for CI 6.

Please note that in the document itself the proponent notes: "The project is also in line with Objective 1.4 of the Climate Change Strategy: Promote Nature-based Solutions with high mitigation impact. This alignment is in sync with the GEF views that investments will support mitigation options in two priority areas: high carbon ecosystems and in the agriculture sector. In the case of this project, the investments will be made in several threaten ecosystems like in the Chaco, Cerrado, the Atlantic Forests, as well as in the Pantanal. Paraguay has 15% of the area of the Pantanal Wetland and is shared with Brazil (60%) and Bolivia (25%). Overall, is the largest carbon reservoir on Earth, storing approximately 10 billion metric tons of carbon, 3 times larger than any other wetlands in the world in which sequestering carbon dioxide through soil structure."

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

Core indicator 6 now included

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted. For information, there is no Core Indicator 6 in the PIF because this is a BD only project.

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) yes, cleared.

b) Please include the theory of change diagram. The section where it says Figure 1. Theory of Change is empty. Once the ToC is submitted, we will review it.

It is not clear from the project description if the project will aim to produce the single close during the lifetime of the GEF project and if GEF resources will contribute to the single close, please clarify.

Please include in the project framework under project outcomes the following outcome: "improving the management effectiveness of the entire PA system" which is what is listed in the Core Indicators. Please also see comments under core indicators. It appears that both components one and two are making contributions to PA management effectiveness.

Please include in the project framework the Core Indicator 6 outcomes.

11/28/2023

Any project that is maintaining vegetative cover as a result of the project intervention, such as a protected area project that will improve management of protected areas such as this, has a mitigation benefit, hence it should use CI 6. Revise accordingly and include estimates for CI 6.

Please note that in the document itself the proponent notes: "The project is also in line with Objective 1.4 of the Climate Change Strategy: Promote Nature-based Solutions with high mitigation impact. This alignment is in sync with the GEF views that investments will support mitigation options in two priority areas: high carbon ecosystems and in the agriculture sector. In the case of this project, the investments will be made in several

threaten ecosystems like in the Chaco, Cerrado, the Atlantic Forests, as well as in the Pantanal. Paraguay has 15% of the area of the Pantanal Wetland and is shared with Brazil (60%) and Bolivia (25%). Overall, is the largest carbon reservoir on Earth, storing approximately 10 billion metric tons of carbon, 3 times larger than any other wetlands in the world in which sequestering carbon dioxide through soil structure."

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

Core indicator 6 now included.

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) Clearance is noted.

b) The ToC diagram was uploaded with the resubmission.

The project aims at producing a single close during the lifetime of the GEF project. No GEF financial resources will contribute to the single close.

Outcome 1.2. ?Improving the management effectiveness of target protected areas? and the indicator ?an increase of 25% in the METT score cards of the target protected areas? were added to the Results Framework.

And the following text was included in the description of Component 1 on the PIF page 11: ?GEF and Co-financing will be used to improve the management effectiveness of a subset of protected areas where the needs are the greatest. The METTs of the target protected areas for investment under Component 1 will be obtained during the PPG phase and presented as part of the Project Document. The name and areas for investment under Component 1 were included in the PIF. These are: Parque Nacional San Luis: ?10.273 has; Parque Nacional Paso Bravo: 103.018 has; Monumento Natural Moises Bertoni: 200 has.?Parque Nacional Ybycui, region Oriental: 5.000 has; Monumento Natural Maciso Acahay: 2.500 has. The total area of the Protected Areas to benefit from investments is 120,991 ha.

For information, there is no Core Indicator 6 in the PIF because this is a BD only project.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Please better reflect gender dimensions in the project in addition to gender parity in the work force. There are gender dimensions in Component 2 (e.g., investments in nature-based health, tourism, etc.) and Component 4 (e.g., knowledge and learning with respect to the gender-related interventions of the project) that should be reviewed during PPG and incorporated in the project outputs as they are developed.

11/28/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

During the PPG phase, the project will develop a gender mainstreaming analysis to identify opportunities to support equality between women and men as part of the anticipated co-benefits linked to Component 2. Also, opportunities to document lessons related to gender equality and social inclusion will be considered as part of component 4.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) Please clarify if the GEF resources under Component Two on PfP are only being used to set up the PfP or if some of these resources will be used in the single close. We encourage CI to liaise with the GEF agencies that have implemented PfP in Latin America to assess how they constructed these components and then revise this component accordingly utilizing the lessons learned and best practice from the GEF portfolio. At the present time this is not clear enough in the PIF.

b) yes, cleared.

c) yes, cleared.

11/28/2023

Cleared for a.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) The GEF resources (and co-financing) under Component 2 (PFP) will be used to set up the PFP only. No resources will be used for the single close. The Component 2 of the PIF was prepared in close coordination with WWF-Paraguay. During the GEF Assembly, the Executing Agency established communication with WWF-US to engage them in the development of the Project Document once the PIF is approved, making use of the experiences and expertise of the Enduring Earth partnership with TNC, The Pew Charitable Trusts and ZOMALAB. Component 2 was modified to incorporate lessons learned during the development of other PFPs in Latin America.

b) Clearance is noted.

c) Clearance is noted.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) Clearance is noted.

b) Clearance is noted.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

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

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

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) Clearance is noted.

b) Clearance is noted.

c) Clearance is noted.

d) Clearance is noted.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) No, the ToC diagram and explanation is missing. Please provide along with all the explanations on causal pathways, assumptions etc.

b) Yes, however, please provide more details on Component Two and the strategy for achieving the single close during the project lifetime.

11/28/2023

The TOC claims GEBs of more than 2 million hectares, but this is not being measured or tracked within the Core Indicators. Either track the 2 million in the core indicators or change the figure in the TOC to match the core indicators. Revise accordingly and ensure this is also consistent with CI 6.

The length of the PIF is still entered as 48 months, please revise.

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

GEBs in the TOC diagram have been updated to match core indicators 1 and 6.
The length of the PIF has been updated to 60 months.

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) The diagram and explanation of the ToC is included. Explanations on causal pathways and assumptions have been provided (page 11-12).

b) The structure of Component 2 in the PIF has been modify and expanded to clarify how the project aims at achieving a single close during the project lifetime (page 14). Considering the task at hand, we added one more year to the project (60 months, first page of the PIF)

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) NA

c) Please expand upon and provide more details on the mechanisms the project will employ to learn from and collaborate with all the PfP projects in LAC.

d) Please expand upon the strategy for KM vis a vis the experience of implementing PfP in Paraguay and how lessons and learnings from other PfP projects in the region will be part of the KM strategy.

11/28/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023

a) Clearance is noted.

b) NA

c) The following text was added to the PIF. The preparation of the PIF is been done in close communication with WWF-Paraguay. The Executing Agency is now in communication with WWF-US in Washington DC, to broaden the relationship with the partners of Enduring Earth (The Nature Conservancy, The Pew Charitable Trusts, World Wildlife Fund and ZOMALAB) to coordinate and gain from their experience in the development and execution of PFPs, including with two GEF funded projects: i) Securing the Future of Peru's Natural Protected Areas (Peru) part of the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program; and ii) Enduring Earth: Accelerating Sustainable Finance Solutions to Achieve Durable Conservation (Gabon & Namibia).

d) ICCF plans to introduce quarterly webinars with PFP developers to address specific issues emerging on specific steps in the implementation of the projects. These lessons learned will be compiled and distributed.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

a) Please clarify if the project proposes to measure METT scores for each PA in the entire PA system at the start, mid-term and close of the project. If so, the core indicators should include the list of all the PAs that comprise the total hectares listed in the Core Indicators.

Please clarify if the targeted investments identified in Component One will be for all protected areas? If so, then each PA has to be listed in the Core Indicators.

Please explain why no estimate is made for Indicator 6 given that improving the management of terrestrial PAs will have a benefit in this regard.

Please include an estimate for CI 6 given that the project proposes to generate CC-M benefits in line with the CC-M FA strategy, CC-M 1.4

Please explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators below core indicator table once all the issues above have been addressed.

b) Until clarification is provided to the comments made in a) above, reviewer cannot answer this question. Upon receipt of a revised PIF, this will be evaluated again.

11/28/2023

Please include an estimate for CI 6 given that the project proposes to generate CC-M benefits in line with the CC-M FA strategy, CC-M 1.4

Please note that in the document itself the proponent notes: "The project is also in line with Objective 1.4 of the Climate Change Strategy: Promote Nature-based Solutions with high mitigation impact. This alignment is in sync with the GEF views that investments will support mitigation options in two priority areas: high carbon ecosystems and in the agriculture sector. In the case of this project, the investments will be made in several threaten ecosystems like in the Chaco, Cerrado, the Atlantic Forests, as well as in the Pantanal. Paraguay has 15% of the area of the Pantanal Wetland and is shared with Brazil (60%) and Bolivia (25%). Overall, is the largest carbon reservoir on Earth, storing approximately 10 billion metric tons of carbon, 3 times larger than any other wetlands in the world in which sequestering carbon dioxide through soil structure."

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

Estimates for core indicator 6 are now included in the PIF.

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

a) METT score cards will be measured for the target protected areas targeted for Component 1 at the start, mid-term and close of the project. The Protected Areas are: Parque Nacional San Luis: 10,273 ha; Parque Nacional Paso Bravo: 103,018 ha; Monumento Natural Moises Bertoni: 200 has. Parque Nacional Ybycui, region Oriental: 5,000 ha; Monumento Natural Maciso Acahay: 2,500 ha;

There is no Core Indicator 6 in the PIF because this is a BD only project. The project is utilizing STAR flexibility to use remaining resources for BD project.

Explanation is added under the core indicator table (pg 17)

b) NA for now

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, all cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, all cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/4/2023

Cleared.

10/24/2023

The project is aligned with only the BD and CC-M FA strategies. Please eliminate references to the LD FA strategy because as designed, the project is not aligned to LD focal area objectives. It also does not include any LD outcomes/outputs or targets.

11/28/2023

At the end of the PIF, when it comes to programming, you have to put the funds by the FA objectives. See below:

Indicative Focal Area Elements

| Programming Directions | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Co-financing(\$) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| BD-1-1 | GET | 1,477,859.00 | 12,248,000.00 |
| LD-1 | GET | 2,204,901.00 DELETE AND PUT THE MONEY UNDER BD 1-1 | |

| Programming Directions | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Co-financing(\$) |
|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------------------|
| CCM-1-4 | GET | 1,396,598.00 DELETE AND PUT THE MONEY UNDER BD 1-1 | |
| Total Project Cost (\$) | | 5,079,358.00 | 12,248,000.00 |

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023:

Financing tables revised

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

References to LD and CC were removed from the PIF except in places where the Portal forces the entry of the CC and LF focal areas used in the project (i.e., GEF Financial Table page 19; Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation page 20; and Indicative Focal Area Elements page 20) In spite that this is a BD only project because of the use of Flexibility.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

On the consultations for this PIF, reference is made to meetings held during when the project was under development in 2020. No update is provided on which if any stakeholder were consulted 3 years later. Please provide an update on the stakeholder consultation undertaken in 2023.

11/28/2023

Please provide more details on the 2023 consultations.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023

Further details on stakeholder consultations have been included

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Consultations were made with the previous (Government ending July 2023) and new Ministers and Vice ministers of the Environment and Sustainable Development of Paraguay, and with the Directorate of the Protected Areas under the Director General of the Protection and Conservation of Biodiversity at the Ministry of the Environment.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

The project has incorrectly filled out the financing tables. As designed, the project is not aligned to LD focal area objective. It also does not include any LD outcomes/outputs or targets. The Rio Marker for LD is set to "0 - no contribution". Therefore, please remove the listed LD objectives from the financing tables.

11/28/2023

The first section of the PIF requires the entry per the FA (source of funds), but at the end of the document, it should be corrected as noted above and programming is done by the FA objectives. Please revise.

12/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 12/04/2023

Programming direction has been updated to reflect the correct focal area.

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

The problem we faced is that when submitting the project through the portal, the system forces the entry of the financial resources coming from the different Focal Areas in spite of the fact that the project is a BD only project using remaining STAR funds from the three focal areas using Flexibility. If the total amount of the project is entered under BD, the system rejects the submission because it determines that BD remaining resources are not enough when calculating the availability of resources against the original BD STR resources.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/4/2023

Cleared.

10/24/2023

There is a mismatch between the Focal Areas in the LoE and those in the Table ?Source of Funds? in Portal: the LoE specifies BD as the STAR focal area where the money coming from, while in the source of funds table the STAR focal areas are Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land degradation.

A new LoE with the details of focal areas and the amounts is required. Whenever the new LoE is received, we will review again the financial tables.

There are two options to fix this: (i) the Agency adjust the information in Portal so that it matches the LoE (recommended, it is the easiest if there are enough funds available in Biodiversity); or (ii) a new LoE that matches the information in Portal will be required (depending on the funds availability). We will review the financing tables once the project is resubmitted.

| Source of Funds | GEF Agency | Focal Area Source | Amount (in US\$) | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | GEF Project Financing | GEF Project Financing Agency Fee | Project Preparation Grant (PPG) | Project Preparation Grant (P Agency F |
| GEFTF | CI | BD STAR | 5,079,358 | 457,142 | 150,000 | 13,500 |
| Total GEF Resources | | | 5,079,358 | 457,142 | 150,000 | 13,500 |

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

| GEF Agency | Trust Fund | Country/ Regional/ Global | Focal Area | Sources of Funds |
|------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| CI | GET | Paraguay | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation |
| CI | GET | Paraguay | Climate Change | CC STAR Allocation |
| CI | GET | Paraguay | Land Degradation | LD STAR Allocation |
| | | | | Total GEF Resources(\$) |

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

A new Letter of Endorsement is now submitted with the revised PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 11/21/2023:

Clearance is noted.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023

No, please revise the project per comments above and resubmit.

11/28/2023

No, please revise the project per comments above and resubmit.

12/4/2023

The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| First Review | 10/30/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 11/28/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 12/4/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |