



# : Support the urgent UN-brokered SAFER Salvage Operation to prevent an environmental, humanitarian and economic oil spill disaster in the southern Red Sea

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11056

**Countries**

Yemen

**Project Name**

: Support the urgent UN-brokered SAFER Salvage Operation to prevent an environmental, humanitarian and economic oil spill disaster in the southern Red Sea

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

6/13/2023

**Review completed by PM**

6/13/2023

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

The project title has changed from "Managing Biodiversity and Environmental Risks Associated with the Safer Salvage Operation in the Red Sea" to "Support the urgent UN-brokered SAFER Salvage Operation to prevent an environmental, humanitarian and economic oil spill disaster in the southern Red Sea".

The Program Manger considers the new title justified and appropriate and approves the project title change. The email confirming the approval of the request has been filed in documents.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **2. Project Summary.**

- a) 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 outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **3. Project Description Overview**

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- 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?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

The project objective remains as approved at PIF stage. Changes in the project components, outcomes and outputs have been justified. Program Manager considers the changes as minor. The project design is in line with the approved project objective and responds adequately to the specific context.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **4. Project Outline**

###### **A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project**

outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

#### **5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) 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?**

**c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Not fully.

On j) Knowledge management: In the KM section, there is reference to 'capturing and analyzing lessons learned and dissemination via the IMO, the standard organization involved in oil spill interventions, and other relevant channels such as IW:LEARN?'. But no details have been provided. Please briefly elaborate on the details. Please also consider to mention that the PPG in parallel includes KM&L activities and a communications strategy/plan for the project.

06/27/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

#### **UNDP Response, 26 June 2023:**

Details have been added to the section on knowledge management, which now reads as follows:

1. Knowledge management has been and will continue to be applied throughout the umbrella SAFER Salvage Operation involving government, private sector and local populations.
2. The project has drawn knowledge from individual oil spill disaster experts and leading organisations in the field, including IMO and SMIT, in the design of the project, and will work with these throughout all its stages. The selection and acquisition of the new VLCC from a globally leading oil tanker fleet agency equally follows best practices.
3. The project is using PPG resources to assess the feasibility over the coming weeks/months of designating and registering the Red Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (LME # 33) as an OECM and on WDPA, during the project's lifetime, which would presumably require an inter-governmental process. This would be accompanied by: i) an assessment of capacity and resource needs to enable enhanced cooperation between countries on the overall management of the Red Sea LME, considering also the differences in capacities and resources across countries; and an assessment focused on the needs and opportunities for enhancing marine conservation in Yemen for the post-salvage period, whether under an OECM or a more regular marine PA approach. These knowledge products will be made available to national and regional stakeholders including PERSGA, and inform the wider SAFER Salvage Operation baseline project or future follow-up work financed by GEF or others.
4. The project has in parallel also been delivering awareness, communication and donor materials that have been prominent globally on media outlets at regular intervals. UNDP, IMO and SMIT (under its parent company Boskalis) are providing regular updates on the status of the salvage operation: <https://twitter.com/beleefboskalis>, <https://boskalis.com/safer>, <https://www.imo.org/en/MediaCentre/HotTopics/Pages/FSO-SAFER-oil-spill-risk.aspx>, <https://www.undp.org/press-releases/un-operation-underway-prevent-catastrophic-oil-spill-red-sea>.
5. Importantly, the SAFER Salvage Operation and its partners will capture and analyse the lessons learnt during this globally visible and relevant salvage operation. The experience gathered by the Aden and Sana'a authorities in Yemen in oil spill prevention will be written up, identifying gains in capacity, structures and equipment, and remaining gaps will be identified. IMO, the standard organization involved in oil spill interventions, as well as the

salvaging contractor SMIT, will compile their detailed analyses of the conduct of this complex and high-risk salvage operation, which could be applied in similar situations in the future.

6. In addition, to bring the voice of the Yemen authorities to global and regional fora, the SSOP will explore opportunities for meaningful participation in specific events where UNDP could support engagement with the global development discourse on oil spill prevention and disaster management. The SSOP furthermore cooperates with countries in the Red SEA and Gulf of Aden that are all exposed to the large vessel traffic to and from the Suez Canal and resulting oil spill risks.

7. At the end of the GEF-financed project, an independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted, and through this, knowledge, experiences and lessons learned will be captured and analyzed in a TE report. This report will become globally available through the UNDP and GEF websites. The lessons from this will also be shared as communication pieces (e.g., blogs, stories, op-eds, through internal UNDP webinars) and become available that are accessible to the public.

**UNDP Response to Section 9.1, 26 June 2023:** (we are pasting our response here as there is no field available for agency entries under Section 9)

2) The Council comments from Germany and Switzerland and the respective responses were added to the Portal section ?B. Project Description?.

The entries are as follows:

26	<p>Switzerland Comments, 8 December 2022</p> <p>Can you please respond to the below mentioned questions?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the plans to close the existing funding gap of the overall UN project?</li> <li>2. What are the expected longer-term impacts of the GEF funded activities (beyond the salvage operation) in relation to the different stakeholder(groups)?</li> <li>3. What kind of mechanisms are being deployed in the GEF part of the project that the provided capacity building is actually well received and stays within the capacitated entities/ministries ? how is ?internal? knowledge management and transfer ensured, beyond the GEF intervention?</li> </ol>	<p>1: The UN Resident Coordinator for Yemen and UNDP have over the past months worked together intensely in fundraising efforts at the highest possible level (involving UNDP Headquarters including the Administrator), to close the funding gap for the SAFER Salvage Operation. A Senior Coordinator at the UN-RC Office for Yemen coordinates these efforts, organising outreach and feedback to donors including via several donor roundtables, and preparing the necessary supporting materials and communication pieces that have been prominent globally on media outlets at regular intervals.</p> <p>2) and 3): With the change of focus in the use of GEF resources ? now assigned primarily to the purchase of the replacement VLCC ? there are no GEF resources left for actively pursuing longer-term impacts beyond the prevention of an imminent disaster.</p> <p>However, assuming that the overall Salvage Operation can be successfully concluded, the following longer-term impacts are expected to result from co-financed activities, and PPG resources for the different stakeholder groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aden and Sana'a authorities: enhanced awareness about the humanitarian, economic and environmental risks from ship traffic and oil sector infrastructure; capacity built on oil spill prevention and management, through participatory planning and participation in the actual salvage operation led by international contractors and agencies; upgraded national oil spill contingency planning documents, structures and equipment.</li> <li>- Selected coastal communities most at risk from SAFER oil spill: enhanced awareness about the humanitarian, economic and environmental risks from ship traffic and oil sector infrastructure; initial capacity built on (best-practice) oil spill management.</li> <li>- Regional stakeholders, incl. PERSGA and neighbouring country governments (especially Djibouti and Saudi Arabia): existence of a regional/transboundary oil spill contingency plan and more clearly defined and rehearsed response roadmaps and command flowcharts for the case of an oil spill disaster.</li> </ul>
----	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Countries sharing the Red Sea Large Marine Ecosystem: from the GEF PPG resources conducting feasibility of enhancing the protection of the Red Sea through cooperative means, starting with listing it as an OECM (Other Effective Conservation Measures) with a view to enabling future long-term investments in enhanced protection.</li> <li>- Science and disaster management and prevention community: further enhanced awareness (including after the March 2021 blockage of the Suez Canal by the Ever Given container ship) of the importance and vulnerability of the Red Sea maritime traffic bottlenecks, with quantitative impact scenarios.</li> <li>- IMO and SMIT: further hands-on experience/learning with a salvage operation in a complex and high-risk environment (recent warfare, sea mines, human security concerns in addition to the more standard oil tanker salvage operation), in terms of careful planning and execution, together with the UN, that could be applied in similar situations in the future .</li> </ul>
27	<p>Germany Comments, 19 Dec 2022</p> <p>Germany approves the PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</p> <p>? Germany welcomes the forward-looking characteristic of the project which is to mitigate potential environmental risks arising from the Safer Salvage Operation in the Red Sea.</p> <p>? Germany considers the activities planned under component 2 as vital for mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into the oil sector. It is important that activities planned under this component have a lasting and long-term impact on governmental stakeholder, regulation and sectoral plan. Germany therefore asks that review of any contingency plans, marine special plan and other strategies will result in the revision and official adoption of documents, including environmental risk mitigation and safeguards for biodiversity.</p>	<p>With the change of focus in the use of GEF resources ? now assigned primarily to the purchase of the replacement VLCC ? the scope of the work on mainstreaming biodiversity into the oil sector and marine spatial planning under Component 2 was reduced. This is explained briefly under response #10 above and in greater depth in the CEO Endorsement Request submission.</p> <p>The main vehicle through which biodiversity is mainstreamed into the salvage operation is via the oil spill contingency planning and related tactical response planning, aimed at protecting the most important marine ecosystems; which is being delivered with the co-financing mobilized under the wider SAFER Salvage Operation. This is being achieved with support from international oil spill experts who work with the authorities in Yemen (Aden and Sanaa) to ensure consistency and ownership. The National Oil Spill Contingency Plan was developed in close cooperation with the Aden and Sanaa authorities and is fully owned by these.</p>

## 5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional,



**national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

The Program Manager approves the exceptional arrangement of direct UNDP implementation as requested by the OFP through the support letter (uploaded to the document section).

Cleared

Agency Response

**5.3 Core indicators**

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes. However, please address the following:

1) The target at CEO endorsement for CI.2 is missing (only the target at PIF stage is entered in the table).

2) The project uses indicator 5.4 as it intends to cover an OECM but provides a link to IW Learn instead of a WDPA-ID. Can you insert the actual WDPA-ID of the Red Sea LME in the table as an OECM? If it has yet to be registered, can you briefly explain if / how it intends to register this LME as an OECM.

06/27/2023: Has been clarified and addressed in the core indicator table and footnotes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 26 June 2023:**

1) The value for the entry of Core Indicator 2 and 2.2 at CEO Endorsement Request stage is 70?. This was now entered on the Portal. This had been explained in the original submission in the CEO-ER Section 6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF): *In addition, in the PIF, protected areas had been explicitly included in the global environment benefits and core indicators, as follows: Socotra Archipelago World Heritage Site 410,400 ha, Socotra Island 362,500 ha, Detwah Lagoon 580 ha, for a total of 773,480 ha. This was removed from this submission.*

2) The Red Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (LME # 33) fully integrates biodiversity objectives, it has however not (yet) been designated or registered as an OECM, and there is no WDPA ID. As per the discussions with GEF SEC in the context of the resubmission, we will keep this sub-indicator, and advance the work of conducting a feasibility assessment by the end of the PPG period on whether and how the designation and registration could be achieved during the project's lifetime, which would require an inter-governmental process; this would be accompanied by an assessment of capacity and resource needs to enable enhanced cooperation between countries on the overall management of the Red Sea LME. The link to IWLEARN under the sub-indicator was removed from the Portal Core Indicator upload section and the Core Indicator Excel file. Please note also that as per the GEF Portal, the correct code for this core sub-indicator is 5.3 (not 5.4); this was amended in the resubmission wherever relevant, including in the Core Indicator Excel file.

In addition, in line with discussions with GEF Secretariat, the numbers of direct beneficiaries were reverted to the numbers at PIF stage. i.e. from the 10,000,000 of the first CEO-ER submission back to the 2,200,000 in the PIF.

Finally, the texts providing the methodology and logic for the core indicators in the Portal Core Indicator upload section and the Core Indicators Excel file were updated for consistency.

#### 5.4 Risks

- a) **Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Note that the overall risk rating for the project has changed from "high" to "low", which is considered justified based on the information provided by the agency.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

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

##### 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Gender has been adequately addressed in the context of this emergency operation and documented as part of the uploaded SESP.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Stakeholder engagement has been adequately addressed in the context of this emergency operation and documented as part of the uploaded SESP.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Not fully.

1) as it is requested in the Template, please provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status? the information currently provided is at a level of output. Please provide the detailed information by using the categories of eligible expenditures included in GEF Guidelines (refer to Table 1 Page 10 in the guidelines).

2) Please also enter the amounts spent to date so that the figures in the table add up to the total amount.

06/27/2023: Addressed - detailed information and figures entered in the table.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 26 June 2023:**

The PPG budget and spending were presented differently using GEF eligible expenditure categories, as follows:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 550,000</b>			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder consultations, engagement and participation, workshops, travel	69,240	17,310	51,930
Consultancies and contracts to develop program and/or project options (national, regional, international, baseline and feasibility studies, project design): PPG Lead Consultant; Senior Stakeholder Coordinator; Communications and KM; OECM Feasibility/Registration	471,760	58,970	412,790
Gender and Environmental and Social Safeguards analyses: Safeguards Expert	9,000	4,500	4,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>550,000</b>	<b>80,780</b>	<b>469,220</b>

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the**

targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes. However, please insert in the template Annex E the information for "Location name, latitude, longitude, ...." as per information that is provided in the text.

06/27/2023: Has been entered.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26 June 2023:

The coordinates in Degrees/Minutes/Seconds format had been included in the CEO-ER narrative. They were now also entered into the required cells on the Portal, in the WGS84 format: LAT 15.101175 N, LON 42.593611 E. This is the approximate location of the FSO SAFER. A comment was also entered in the Locality Description to explain that the targeted area can be appreciated in the oil spill scenario maps uploaded to this section.

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023: Yes. However,



1) please also paste the budget table in the portal template in the space provided in Annex G. (Please contact the Program Manager if there are any technical issues with pasting the budget table there).

06/27/2023: Has been pasted into the portal template field.

Cleared

### Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26 June 2023:

The Excel version of the budget table had been uploaded to *Annex G: Budget Table* in the Portal, per the Portal instructions. While instructions for the text cell in Annex G state "Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here", wherefore we understood this space was for further explanations/justifications.

The budget was now pasted into this text cell as per this request.

### **Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

### **Additional Annexes**

### **9. GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/13/2023:

1) Please address comments made in this review.

2) Please address Council comments made by Germany and Switzerland at PIF / Council approval stage (these comments can be found in the stakeholder comments section in the

portal, please include responses (a) in a response box in the review sheet and (b) in the respective Annex of the Agency project document).

06/27/2023: Resubmission has adequately addressed all comments made in the review dated 06/13/2023. Responses to Council comments have been inserted into the Knowledge Management section.

Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Cleared

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>6/13/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/27/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		