



# Vulnerable Twenty Group funding programme to leverage adaptation by averting and minimizing impacts of climate change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11055

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Vulnerable Twenty Group funding programme to leverage adaptation by averting and minimizing impacts of climate change

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

12/1/2023

**Review completed by PM**

3/19/2024

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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

In the summary, please articulate the intended adaptation benefits from the project.

Given the recent COP approval for the L&D Fund, please provide a reference and potential linkage in the current context. Please add this in the summary and also across the proposal.

February 15. Thank you. The comment is cleared. Please engage the GEF Secretariat in all strategic meetings and dialogues which are linked with L&D related to this project.

## Agency Response

UNIDO 26/01/2024

Reference to adaptation benefits and L&D fund included both in the summary and in the proposal.

### 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

Yes. Please see the review sheet for technical comments on the specific components and co-financing.

Comment 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

Figure 4 is not visible. Please upload again.

As commented earlier, please include reference to the L&D fund approval at COP28 and its potential link with the project.

The climate data barrier is an important one highlighted in the document. Please clarify how this will be addressed if the project doesn't explicitly address this barrier.

GEFSEC Feb 20

Thanks. Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

UNIDO 26/01/2024

- We tried to upload figure 4 from different browsers and PCs but unfortunately the portal doesn't allow us. You can find figure 4 in a word document in the document upload section under "roadmap".

- Rationale has been revised to include L&D fund as follows:

*?In addition to the adaptation funds mobilised by the LDCF/SCCF, the V20 will mobilise additional resources for addressing loss and damage in its member states. This will be done through the implementation of a Fund Mobilisation Strategy, which will be designed and implemented by the V20 as part of Project Component 1. The strategy will identify sources of financing that will contribute to the VFP and may include, but not be limited to, grants from the V20's Joint Multi Donor Fund, loss and damage funds (e.g., such as the L&D fund approved during COP28), financing institutions (e.g., banks), private sector, etc. The LDCF/SCCF portion will support complementary adaptation action to the funds provided by those sources.?*

- With regards to the barriers that the project intends to address, these are described in Table 2 (page 10), which is complemented by Figure 3 information collected during PPG. Figure 2 includes barriers (reasons) that private sector perceives as risks for getting involved in climate adaptation investments, which are summarised from World Bank Group's report 'Enabling Private Investment in Climate Adaptation & Resilience' (the source was also clarified in the Figure caption apart from the footnote), to provide additional context and baseline information. 'Lack of climate data' is not explicitly listed in Table 2 as an individual barrier, however the proposed project will address this topic by increasing the capacity, knowledge and skills of key actors in the climate change adaptation field enabling them to better understand what information, data and assessments are important for decision-making processes associated to investing in climate change adaptation projects. Component 3 is dedicated to learning and knowledge management, therefore contributing to addressing the availability and accessibility to climate information as well as by providing training on the subject through the actions described in Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 (e.g., the Online Platform, the regional hubs, the training courses, etc.).

## 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

Figures 4, 5 and 7, 10 are not visible in the CEO ER. Please add again.

1. Figure 5- VFP Theory of Change is not visible. Please upload again and correct the reference sentence which says Figure 4.

The GEF/UNIDO project's Theory of Change (ToC) presented in Figure 4 demonstrates the complex and multifaceted nature of climate change adaptation that is long-term in scope.

2. Please clarify the following sentence in the context that the project is mainly funded by LDCF and targeted to LDCs:

It is important to refer that the project activities are to support the deployment of adaptation TPS across all the V20 member countries, that includes 58 members as of July 2023, but it will also be applicable to new members that may join the group in the months and years to come (during the implementation of the project).

3. For a project that is essentially locally-led and community focused, please include 50% women beneficiaries. Therefore please revise the below:

The GEF/UNIDO Project will target 40% women, 30% youth participation in its activities to the extent possible.

4. Please refer to the sentence below under C1.

"Component 1 aims to design, establish, and monitor the VFP that will provide technical and/or financial support for impactful and innovative locally led loss and damage adaptation TPS...."

Please mention "adaptation" only.

5. In the Steering Committee of the project, please consider including GEF Secretariat.

6. Please elaborate if other funding options have been explored for the VFPs. It is good to note the initial mobilization of 800k, but it is quite low. Given the latest context of large scale L&D financing commitment, are there opportunities which this project can tap?

7. In the exit strategy, the proposal may consider including the L&D Fund as one of the sources.

8. Output 2.1.2 and 3.1.2.1- we note that UNIDO will share and disseminate experiences using its own online platform. It's welcome. We also recommend that V20 create a dedicated webpage around this initiative to provide information about this project and include a knowledge portal within it. This will ensure mainstreaming of this initiative with wider V20 work. Please also specify potential forums where the knowledge will be disseminated e.g. forums where V20 engages such as COPs, their board meetings, etc.

GEFSEC Feb 20

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO 26/01/2024:

1. Figures 5, 7, 10 have been re-uploaded.
2. This sentence means that an activity located in an LDC that enters the V20 during the project implementation period will have the same opportunity to apply for the VFP, as those who are currently part of the group. We are not excluding potential new countries that may become official members of the V20 during the project implementation period. The text has been modified as follows in the Prodoc: *It is important to refer that the project activities are to support the deployment of adaptation TPS across all the V20 member countries, including current members as well as potential new countries that may become official members of the group during the implementation period of the project. As of July 2023, the V20 included 58 members.*
3. Target has been revised in the Project document and applicable annexes.
4. Sentence revised. Reference to 'Loss and damage' has been deleted.
5. This has been revised and the GEF Secretariat has been included. Changes are in:
  - Section 6 'Institutional Arrangement and Coordination'
  - Figure 12 'implementation arrangement for the proposed GEF/UNIDO project'
6. Alternatives such as L&D funds will be sought and approached as part of Component 1, by implementing a Fund Mobilisation Strategy. The V20 will be responsible for implementing this strategy and may include sources such as L&D funds.
7. This has been included as a potential option to consider for the exit strategy under Activity 1.1.2.5 where it is described.
8. Activity 3.1.2.1 proposed the development of an online platform. This platform will be developed and hosted by the V20 website. This online platform will be linked to UNIDO's website. The text has been revised under Output 2.1.2, to clarify this. With regards to potential means (e.g., forums) where the knowledge will be disseminated, this is clarified under 'Activity 3.1.3.1 Develop the Communication Strategy to increase the visibility of the project across the V20'. The text has been revised as follow: *The Communication Expert will have to, amongst other things, assess possible communication means to recommend the most effective outreach and communication actions to reach the stakeholders and target audiences of the GEF/UNIDO Project activities. The communication means to be identified by the Expert may include for instance, online or in-person forums, conferences, side-events to global meetings where the V20 participates or is planning to participate, e.g., COP, their board meetings, the V20 Ministerial Dialogue events, etc. The Communications Expert and the V20 will select the appropriate events where to make the project visible. The Communication Expert*

*will also take care of the design, branding and content planning of the project?s Online Platform (Output 3.1.2) as well as the content for the identified events?.*

## **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

a) Yes

b) The GEF is supportive of UNIDO's EE role for this project and understands that during the implementation period, after V20 becomes a legal entity will transfer the EE role to them. Please see two comments:

- in the CEO ER, please provide a more detailed rationale for the EE role as per the request made through email to GEF Secretariat.

- please notify the GEF when the EE role is transferred through official channels.

c) please add any other GEF projects that could complement this project and could benefit from cooperation and coordination. For example, the Sierra Leone MSME LDCF project by UNIDO or projects of similar nature by other agencies.

GEFSEC Feb 20

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO 26/01/2024

b) Detailed rationale added in the section dedicated to the role of UNIDO as PEE.

c) About coordination with other projects, we have included Table 12 which currently displays several projects, the Sierra Leone MSME LDCF project included. We have augmented the table by adding: Amplifying the impact of the ?Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation? of the Global Environment Facility through learning and knowledge management.

### 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

- In the meta indicator, SCCF is tagged as False. As the project uses some SCCF financing, please tick SCCF B as True.

- Regarding collaboration other funds, the CEO ER includes an adaptation fund project in Table 6. Please review this question in the meta information sheet and correct.

- Our understanding is that this project will be strongly locally-led. In this context, we don't agree that the following question's response is False. Please correct.

**This project will directly engage local communities in project design and implementation**

- In the sectoral classification, please clarify if there won't be any focus on nature-based management/nature based solutions.

- The core indicator target 1 is very low for an LDCF project of this scale. Please consider revising it.

- There is no need to provide core indicators for LDCF and SCCF separately. Please blend it into one.

- We couldn't see values in any of the sub-indicators. Please resubmit the indicators.

GEFSEC 20 Feb: Please consider revising indicator 1.

GEFSEC 27 Feb: Thank you. The revised target is fine now.

#### Agency Response

UNIDO, 26/01/2024

- SCCF is tagged as false because there is one table for LDCF (where we ticked LDCF only) and one for SCCF (where we ticked SCCF only).

- Done.

- Done.

- Sectoral classification has been revised to include nature-based management.
- The calculation of 30,000 direct beneficiaries was carried out having into account that on average a household across the V20 member countries has around 4 people. The average number of people per household was extrapolated from [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/popfacts/PopFacts\\_2017-2.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/popfacts/PopFacts_2017-2.pdf). A higher number might not reflect the actual reach of the project. Please also consider that 10,000 are indirect beneficiaries and 240 people will be trained.
- Core indicators sheets for LDCF and SCCF are created automatically by the portal, we cannot change this or merge them.
- Values for sub-indicators added.

UNIDO 21/02/2024

Core indicator 1 revised.

#### 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 assessed 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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**  
**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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 Yes.

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

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. We welcome the collaboration proposed with CDRI. GEF Secretariat will be happy to facilitate the collaboration if needed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

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 Yes.

Agency Response  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
Yes

GEFSEC March 14, 2024

The Agency is requested to address the following comments from PPO:

1. On Gender (comment provided by Verona): Please ensure that in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3, gender perspectives are captured, and women's engagements are ensured. In Outputs 2.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1, please incorporate gender-related aspects in the knowledge products, training materials, and results/experiences to be produced and disseminated. Please ensure that the 50 demonstration projects referred to in Outputs 2.1.1 engage and benefit women-led community groups, CSOs, MSMEs. Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted, monitored and reported on.

Please ask the Agency to respond to the questions below:

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;  
improving women's participation and decision making; and or  
generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (yes /no)

2. On Stakeholder engagement : Although Table 9 included MSMEs / CSOs / NGOs (to be identified), and NGOs, Women, Youth and Vulnerable Groups Associations and representatives among the Categories of Stakeholders, no details on these groups or organizations were provided. Please ask agency to clarify and provide more details on consultations with these stakeholders and plans to engage them in project development.

Please ask the Agency to answer the question (under Table 9) Select what role civil society will play in the project:

- ? Consulted only;
- ? Member of Advisory Body; contractor;
- ? Co-financier;
- ? Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;
- ? Executor or co-executor;
- ? Other (Please explain)

3. On GEO Location Information: Under annex E, fields related to the geo location of project activities are empty. Please add the location of project activities, location name, latitude, longitude, Geo Name ID (if applicable) in the dedicated fields.

4. On Annex I: please request the agency to include, in Annex I, a response/acknowledgement to the comment from the Council Member from Germany

GEFSEC 15th March: Thanks for addressing the comments. The comment is cleared.

The PM would like to add that the project involves engaging with local CSOs in identifying and implementing innovative community led adaptation solutions. These will be identified during the project implementation in consultation with the V20 member countries.

## Agency Response

UNIDO 15/03/2024

1.

- Yes, this is ensured as the composition of the VFP Committee aims at involving all vulnerable groups, including women. In addition, in all cases where committees, technical experts groups, etc. are formed, the project will aim at having a balanced representation of women. The demonstration projects proposals that will apply for support from this project need to include how their innovation addresses gender perspectives and/or benefits women and/or other vulnerable groups. The ?Inclusion of gender, youth and other vulnerable groups? is one of the topics that will be evaluated as part of the project selection process. The VFP monitoring will include indicators to ensure women and youth participation tracking, as well as that of other relevant vulnerable groups.

- Yes, this is already considered. A focus will be put to capture the role and experiences of the most vulnerable (the poor, women, youth, indigenous peoples) in benefiting from the adaptation TPS. The training will track gender participation and aim at having 50% women participation. All materials produced are required to the project?s communication strategy and be gender-responsive.

- Yes, the selection process for these demonstration projects will analyse how they engage, involve, impact and benefit women, and stated previously.

- Yes, a draft plan has been included and will be monitored by the Gender focal point within the PMU.

- Boxes related to result areas for gender equality were already ticked (all three).

2.

- Specific organisations will be identified during the selection process of the demonstration projects to ensure that representatives of vulnerable groups are located in the countries where the projects will take place.

- CSO role was already selected (consulted-only)

3. Done.

4. Done.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 Yes

Agency Response

### 8.3 Source of Funds

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request LOEs are not required as the program is global in nature.

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 Yes.

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 Global project. LOEs not needed.

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 NA

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 NA

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 total project financing (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 Yes

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**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

Yes

Agency Response

**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

Agency Response  
Additional Annexes  
**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**  
**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
Not yet.

The Agency is requested to address the comment related to core indicator and resubmit the project.

The project is cleared. All comments have been addressed satisfactorily.

GEFSEC March 14: The agency is requested to address additional comments listed under the review question " LDCF under the principle of equitable access?" and respond in the related agency box how the comments have been addressed.

GEFSEC March 19: the agency has addressed the comments. Regarding the engagement of CSOs during implementation, please refer to PM's comments in the section " LDCF under the principle of equitable access".

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
During the inception phase, V20 and UNIDO is requested to engage the GEF Secretariat in various consultation meetings.

Despite the request to involve us in the strategic meetings during PPG phase, we were not informed by V20 (particularly) regarding how the project is being aligned with their processes and future directions. Once the CEO endorsement is cleared, we would like to have an inception meeting with the team before activities are started.

Also, as commented in the review sheet, UNIDO is recommended to track the legal formation of V20 and add them as the Executing Agency for this project.

**9.3 Review Dates**

**CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/15/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/20/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/27/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/14/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/19/2024</b>	