

# Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development??

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11467

**Countries**

Global (Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines, Suriname, Ukraine)

**Project Name**

Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development??

**Agencies**

WWF-US, ADB, UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/19/2023

**Review completed by PM**

11/10/2023

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

PFD

# GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

## 1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

11/15/2023

Cleared.

11/10/2023

Program Commitment Deadline was now wrongly entered as 8/9/2035, should be 8/9/2025, please fix.

10/30/2023

Yes, for the most part.

Please enter Program Commitment Deadline date as 9 August 2025.

GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	
---------------------	------------------	------------------------------	--

Agency's Comments

11/15/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Thank you for flagging, this has been corrected

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Thank you for this comment, the program commitment deadline has been adjusted to be August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**2. Program Summary**

**a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**3 Indicative Program Overview**

**a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

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

**c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**

**d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**4 Program Outline**

**A. Program 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 program design?

b) Has 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 program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

## 5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

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

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program 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? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

**f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?**

**g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?**

**h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?**

**i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared for all but gender.

Please include gender equality considerations in Program Outcomes 1.2 and 4.2. Please ensure that KM & Learning also bring out lessons learned in gender mainstreaming and in gender-specific results/outcomes.

In the Section on Stakeholder Engagement, sub-section: Gender mainstreaming: There's a reference to the GCF requirements on gender, but no reference to the GEF Policy and Guidance. Is there a particular reason why this is so? Please make reference to GEF's related policy/guidance.

It is noted that the PFD includes some references to key stakeholders consulted in PFD development as well as indicative information on their potential roles. Please indicate the expectations on their roles related to the program outcomes and components 1, 2, and 4, specifically related to the role and engagement of civil society organizations generally and provide more details on the approach on stakeholder engagement as related to the Coordination Child Project. In addition, please further develop and elaborate on these aspects of the Program and Coordination Child Project during the PPG and project design phase.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Language supporting gender equality considerations has been added to Program Outcomes 1.2 and 4.2.

This has also been added to the KM and Learning section of the PFD.

Thank you for flagging, this has been addressed, and specific reference is now made to the GEF's Policy on Gender Equality.

Additional language has been incorporated in each of the stakeholder groups as defined in the PFD (covering the Program and Coordination Child Project) to ensure that the roles as well as their contribution to the different components are more clearly defined. This will be elaborated further during PPG.

#### **5.2 Program coherence and consistency**

**a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?**

**b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

**c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?**

**d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?**

**e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared for a,b,c, and e.

Please revise or clarify the child project submissions as indicated below:

#### **Malaysia CP**

Please provide describe ESS for government, financiers, and project developers versus what is in the realm of GRID's upstream engagement on transformational levers and national-level work to shape development overall.

Unclear why ESS risk rating is low given the amount of investment in site-based activities such as restoration and other NbS solutions (and given the ports are large infrastructure development in sensitive areas). Please explain or revise accordingly.

## **Nepal CP**

Please include an LOE from Nepal prior to resubmission. This project will not be included for Council approval without this.

It isn't clear why the Business As Usual (BAU) with the loan project would contain limited consideration of ecosystem services and biodiversity? for this highway project since this should be squarely included in the ESS and mitigation measures that project financiers and the government are responsible for, versus GRID given we are going for transformational change through upstream approaches. Please refine to indicate the additionality of the GEF project more clearly versus the BAU with an MDB loan package.

Have avoidance scenarios been considered as alternatives to the current plan of transecting the connectivity of Parsa National Park with the highway? Could this be incorporated into upstream engagement through GRID? Please revise and clarify accordingly.

## **Suriname**

Please further elaborate on component 3 priorities.

Maps in Figure 3 are helpful, but please reiterate the focus of this CP in relation to the scope of policy engagement intended to address the big-picture of infrastructure development planned in the interior, e.g., will this CP also work on policy/enabling environment activities that will shape the future planning for infrastructure development in the interior/nationally? Please revise and update accordingly.

## **Ukraine**

Our understanding is the M06 highway already exists, as such it is unclear the extent to which upstream measures regarding policy and planning which is central to the GRID TOC can be taken. Please clarify and address and elaborate how this project is aligned with the GRID TOC in this regard.

To what extent is the 2030 infrastructure being revised to adapt to ongoing conflict and nature-positive post-war infrastructure reconstruction? Could be an opportunity for GEF support under GRID? Please clarify.

## **Philippines**

Low core indicator targets, please revise during PPG.

IPIF goal of 60% of projects contributing to implementation of national climate targets, including NDCs. Why only 60% and how are projects aligned with GBF targets and what contribution are they making to the GBF targets? Given recent MDB commitments to

Paris and Kunming-Montreal alignment please further elaborate for this CP as well as **Nepal CP.**

### **Global coordination platform child project**

Please provide a next layer down of detail to enable review of global platform child project that is commensurate with the national child projects. It is justified to leave flexibility for further definition of areas of focus and activities to PPG and beyond, but further detail is needed, particularly around the topics flagged in this review sheet.

Knowledge hub: Given sustainability and additionality concerns is there another hub/forum that GRID could partner with or contribute to instead of creating its own distinct entity that might not live beyond the life of the Program/Project? Please discuss sustainability strategy more generally as well on the knowledge hub.

Capturing existing knowledge activity: Not clear that a review of GEF projects is the best place to start given this is a fairly new and limited area of investment and given that GEF's portfolio is quite small. Please revised to indicate a more inclusive approach given that it is very likely that the best sources of information and good practice are external to the GEF.

Section on Knowledge partners and stakeholder engagement-Please provide more details here.

Transformational levers- It is clear that the exact agenda around this is TBD, but please indicate what is envisioned at a higher level to provide a sense of what this component will be. Currently unclear. (e.g. meetings? Online tools? Publications? Etc) There are two critical areas that GRID could make significant impacts for systems change, that would align well with GEF priorities, including:

- 1.) Behavior change and social science approaches-If a technocratic approach to sustainable infrastructure development was sufficient there would be no need for GRID, therefore there is a significant need for behavior change and application of social science approaches. Institutional arrangements, understanding political and financial power and incentives and working within to shift and change dynamics are critical to trigger transformation and sustain green infrastructure development is essential. These areas need to be considered and prioritized for support and engagement of the global child project. Please include.



2.) Policy coherence- No where else is the need for and challenge of policy coherence more obvious than infrastructure development: Coherence between national policies and laws and MEA commitments for biodiversity and climate; coherence between the legislative/parliamentary and executive branch actions; coherence between financial and policy incentives and nature positive carbon neutral development. Therefore, policy coherence should be a core unifying theme for GRID and show up prominently in the agenda of the Global Platform in terms of concrete support provided to national projects, tools and technical support provision and amplifying what is working and what isn't to influence broader adoption and commitments. There also may be exciting opportunities to link this to the work that the GEF is doing regarding policy coherence with parliamentary caucuses in several countries. Please include.

Please provide discussion of how the Global Coordination Project is envisioned to draw-in and produce technical and knowledge products and support engagement of partners. What is the model? Will it be with technical support packages? PSC with broad engagement of partners in the field? Something else entirely? Even if the details aren't known now, please elaborate on some of the current thinking that is present now and then the general process for building the model during PPG.

Please include further discussion on the difference between national ESS requirements and the focus and investment of GRID including e.g. how GRID is different from and will avoid taking the place of, activities along the mitigation hierarchy that are the responsibility of project financiers and developers (ESS, mitigation, restoration etc)?

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

#### **Malaysia CP:**

The port companies and project developers have limited approaches to environmental and social safeguarding, including habitat studies for environmental impact assessments, eco-tourism programs that engage local communities, river clean-up programs, and community patrolling incentives for reporting environmental wrongdoing, mostly as part of their CSR. These approaches treat environmental assets as external to the project. In

contrast, the child project seeks to make environmental assets internal to port management and expansion policies. By demonstrating the values that ecosystems can provide to port resilience, the project aims to make the protection and restoration of these systems an important part of climate risk mitigation (environmental safeguards) for the ports. Furthermore, as part of stakeholder engagement, the project also aims to bring in communities that are impacted by port infrastructure such as local fishing communities, currently not included within EIA.

This project can inform the Green Port Policy of all ports by advocating for the integration of ecosystem restoration and conservation in current green policies of individual ports. At present, green port policies of ports are targeted to carbon emissions reductions through energy efficiency, with little or no emphasis on ecosystem health/ resilience. The project also aims to demonstrate the implementation of the spatial planning framework of the 4th National Physical Plan, which advocates for spatial sustainability in planning. Specifically, the project seeks to include nature-based solutions in implementation of strategy 5 of the plan, which focuses on reducing the risk of natural disasters and climate change, and to demonstrate innovative ways to bring together strategies 5 and 6 (on preserving and conserving ecological assets). Additionally, the project can inform the National Transport Policy currently lacking on financing options, for environmentally and socially responsible port development and investments. Lastly, the project aims to influence the guidelines on nature-based solutions for climate risk mitigation within the National Port Blueprint, which will be implemented in 2025-2040.

The risk rating has been updated to moderate.

**Nepal CP:**

The Nepal Letter of Endorsement has been uploaded to the portal.

The BAU with the MDB loan package and additionality of the GEF project have been further explained in the CP Concept Note.

The Child Project is focused on a road expansion project, therefore avoidance scenarios are not as applicable, as new road routes would lead to further fragmentation.

The GHG calculation for Core Indicator 6 has been uploaded to the Portal. The emissions are considered indirect since they will be achieved through the loan, with the GEF project contributing indirectly through capacity building and removing barriers. The figures will be reassessed during PPG.

**Suriname CP:**

Additional detail has been added to Component 3.

The description under the Figure 3 map has been revised to reiterate the scope of policy engagement and its potential to address infrastructure development in the interior/nationally.

A target has been added for CI 6, and the EX-ACT tool has been uploaded.

**Ukraine CP:**

Thank you for this observation. The M06 highway is among the primary road repair and reconstruction projects presented by the Head of the State Agency for Reconstruction and Development of Infrastructure, Mustafa Nayem, at the Ukraine Recovery Conference 2023 in London this year. It is expected that it will turn into the most frequented road connection in the country with more lanes, more fencing, and higher speeds. This will translate into much lower wildlife connectivity compared to the current state of the road, which is far below Western European highway standards.

This is consequently an excellent moment not only to plan road infrastructure repair but also restoration of landscape connectivity in line with Ukraine's commitment to the Global Biodiversity Framework and ambition to meet the environmental EU acquis. This GEF GRID project will facilitate integrated planning and provide the necessary database. Our proposed pilot sites within the existing and most heavily trafficked M06 highway will fill ecological data gaps within the three key types of natural landscapes of the country the highway is crossing. We will be able to extrapolate the developed applied recommendations and methods to other important transport arteries within the country, both those for which repair is planned and new ones. Analysis conducted under the project will make it possible to develop legal and economic recommendations at the national level and influence the state's investment policy for sustainable transport infrastructure development.

The revision of the Infrastructure Strategy 2030 depends on how and under what conditions the war will end. These conditions will determine the load on the transportation infrastructure and structure of traffic flows in Ukraine and neighbouring countries. The project will facilitate the development of recommendations for the revision anticipated over the coming years to avoid the repetition of past mistakes and develop/reconstruct environmentally friendly sustainable transport infrastructure.

**Philippines CP:**

A target has been added for CI 6. Targets for other core indicators will be assessed for inclusion during PPG.

How is the 60% target identified? The IPIF is now in its third round of financing. The first loan for the IPIF was provided in 2017 for US\$ 100 million. The second 'additional financing' for the facility was in 2019 for US\$ 200 million. This financing was intended for DPWH and DoTR to design and deliver quality infrastructure projects; as well as provide some capacity development for both Government departments to embed management systems within the relevant sections / divisions. The second tranche, essentially scaled up the IPIF and brought within its scope, some additional flagship transport programs and projects. The third tranche or 'second additional financing' is the baseline for this GEF project. This new round of funding has additional focus on

integration of climate considerations in project preparation. The estimation of 60% of the portfolio achieving climate targets is based on two factors; i) that some proposed loans in the pipeline may not materialize, or may not have significant climate focus, and ii) estimates made on the practical experiences under the first two rounds of financing ? which was roughly 66%.

Text has been added to the Nepal CP and PH CP on alignment to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

### **Global Coordination Platform Child Project:**

The strategy section of the global platform child project has been expanded upon.

Sustainability considerations are now included as part of the knowledge hub description. A program-level website will be developed, and partnerships with existing hubs will be explored during PPG to ensure sustainability/scaling beyond the life of the program.

Well noted on capturing existing knowledge, this has been clarified in the text, which now includes a more inclusive review to source information and good practices.

Additional detail has been provided on key stakeholders and their anticipated roles in the project.

1), 2) A description is now included in the strategy section to include transformational levers related to behavior change/social science approaches and policy coherence.

Additional information has been provided on how knowledge will be identified, packaged, and shared, both through engagement with the countries and by leveraging partner coordination mechanisms (PSC, Advisory Group, etc). See Component 3 text in the Global Coordination Project CN. This will be further detailed during PPG.

Information has been added to the Global Coordination Project to address this.

### **5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs**

**a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

##### **5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting**

**a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**

**b) 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/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**c) Are the program'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?**

**d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Please ensure that the sum of Core and Sub-Indicator values across child projects adds up to the value entered at PFD level.

Please consider inserting in child project information data on the Terrestrial Protected Area Core Indicator. This information is for now only reflected at PFD level and has not been entered in the Portal at child project level (Nepal). As a result, it is not yet captured in Portal reports.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Thank you for this suggestion. Now that the Nepal Child Project sub-indicators have been added in that child project, the totals in the PFD reflect the correct amounts incorporating all child project's targets.

The Nepal Child Project data for the Terrestrial Protected Area Core Indicator have been added to the Portal.

#### **5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes**

**a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

In the "Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes", please enter an Overall Risk Rating.

The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and WWF-US attached the Environmental and Social Safeguards Pre-Screen. Transportation infrastructure (including port, road, and highway) may have significant social impact related to access to resources, economic displacement, resettlement, and indigenous peoples. Please make this more explicit in the PFD with regards to how this will be addressed as part of the work of the program on strengthening the enabling environment for ensuring that transportation infrastructure is sustainable from inception. Please also further develop this element in the PPG phase and further development of the project design.

11/10/2023

Responses from the Agency in the Project Review Sheet seem to indicate that the Agency understands the "Overall Risk Rating" under the Risk to Achieving Outcomes as being the ESS ratings. Instead, the required rating to select here is a judgment made by the Agency on the overall risk to achieving project outcomes based on their sense of the relative importance of risks under each risk category, of which ESS is one of them. It could be that this Overall Risk Rating is Moderate just like for ESS, or the Agency may decide to choose another rating. The Agency is kindly requested to provide an Overall Risk Rating under the Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes table.

### **5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes**

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?**
  
- c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

### **Secretariat's Comments**

10/30/2023

In the "Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes", please enter an Overall Risk Rating.

The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and WWF-US attached the Environmental and Social Safeguards Pre-Screen. Transportation infrastructure (including port, road, and highway) may have significant social impact related to access to resources, economic displacement, resettlement, and indigenous peoples. Please make this more explicit in the PFD with regards to how this will be addressed as part of the work of the program on strengthening the enabling environment for ensuring that transportation infrastructure is sustainable from inception. Please also further develop this element in the PPG phase and further development of the project design.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

11/15/2023

Cleared.

### **Agency's Comments**

11/15/2023 GEF Agency Response:

The IP is rated moderate for overall risk, based on the number and types of risks presented in the table and their potential impact to program outcomes. This rating is included under the "Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes" table.

The ESS risk rating is considered moderate (Category B) given the on-ground work being supported under the Program (restoration in Malaysia).

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

The project overall risk rating is considered "moderate". This has been added to the risk section.

This has been addressed in the ESS Pre-Screen, and some information has been included in the PFD (section on social impacts, and some text has been added to reference social and environmental considerations under Component 1). This information will be further developed during the PPG phase.

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

**6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**\*For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments



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

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

For the responses to 'cross cutting principles' and other boxes please remove highlight and only use the word for the response to the question (YES or NO) so it can be clearly understood even when printed in black and white

Community Health and Security safeguard risk-The potential impacts of base loan to the infrastructure project in Nepal is cited, but the ESS and mitigation measures fall squarely on the financiers and government, not the GEF, so that should be clearly stated.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Thank you, this has been addressed.

ESS mitigation measures will indeed be undertaken by financiers and government as part of the baseline activities, these activities will not be covered under the GEF project. This has been clarified in the ESS Pre-screen.

GEF funding will focus on incremental benefits, including the creation of overarching upstream policies (in coordination with involved stakeholders) that would ensure biodiversity is standardized in the conceptualization and design of all transportation infrastructure projects.

## **8 Other Requirements**

### **Knowledge Management**

**8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

## **9 Annexes**

### **Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)**

#### **9.1 GEF Financing Table:**

**a) 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):**

**Country STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments  
**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments  
10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments  
10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments  
10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments  
10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

**IP Set Aside**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IP Contribution**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)**

**b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program?**

**The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?**

**c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?**

- d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?**
- e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?**
- f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?**
- g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation**  
**Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements**  
**For non-IP Programs**  
**Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

**9.5 Indicative Co-financing**

**Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**9.6 Has the program and its respective child 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's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, however, please include an LOE from Nepal prior to resubmission. This project will not be included for Council approval without this.

Also, the name of executing entity is different between LOE and Portal's child project entry for the following countries, please correct child projects to match with LOE:

Ukraine, Philippines, Suriname.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

### Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

The Letter of Endorsement for Nepal has been uploaded.

Thank you for this comment, the name of the executing entities in the Concept Notes/PFD now match the LOEs.

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

### Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, however, please include an LOE from Nepal prior to resubmission. This project will not be included for Council approval without this.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

### Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

The Letter of Endorsement for Nepal has been uploaded.

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

### Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, however, please include an LOE from Nepal prior to resubmission. This project will not be included for Council approval without this.

11/10/2023

Yes, cleared.

## Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

The Letter of Endorsement for Nepal has been uploaded.

### **Annex C: Program Locations**

**9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?**

## Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Yes, cleared.

## Agency's Comments

### **Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes\* (\*only for non IP programs)**

**9.9 a) Does the program 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.**

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

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

## Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

NA.

## Agency's Comments

### **Additional Annexes**

#### **10 GEFSEC Decision**

##### **10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the program recommended for clearance?**



## Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

No. Please revise per the comments above and resubmit.

Please also note that there are currently two attachments for the concept notes in the Portal, please leave only one final document for review.

11/10/2023

Two minor issues must be addressed as noted above on Program Commitment Deadline date and the program risk section. Please make the necessary revisions and resubmit.

11/15/2023

Yes, Program is recommended for clearance.

## Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

Unfortunately the portal does not allow us to delete the first concept note documents that were uploaded.

An attachment with the updated concept notes has been uploaded as part of the second submission titled [Annex H\\_9 Nov 23\\_Submission 2\\_Child Project Concept Notes](#)

**10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.**

## Secretariat's Comments

10/30/2023

Please include how are projects aligned with the relevant GBF targets as well as objectives of the UNFCCC.

## Philippines

Low core indicator targets are presented in the child project concept, please revise these numbers during PPG with hopefully an increase in the target aspiration.

## Agency's Comments

11/9/2023 GEF Agency Response:

A target has been added for CI 6. Targets for other core indicators will be assessed for inclusion during PPG.

**10.3 Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/31/2023</b>	<b>11/9/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/14/2023</b>	<b>11/15/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/15/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		