

Building climate resilience in supply chains for the mobilization of adaptation funding

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10934

Countries

Regional

Project Name

Building climate resilience in supply chains for the mobilization of adaptation funding

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

3/14/2022

Review completed by PM

5/20/2022

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.25.2022:

Cleared:

04.19.2022:

Guatemala and Honduras are still indicated twice under entry ?Country?.

03.28.2022:

- Countries: Guatemala and Honduras are indicated twice under entry ?Country?.
- Rio Marker: CCA should be '2'. Otherwise, please explain.
- 24 month duration for implementation time is short, considering start up and close down time needed. May wish to consider making a little longer.

Agency Response

04/22/2022:

We removed Guatemala and Honduras and it's not visible from our view.

CI-GEF 04/12/2022:

- double entries removed

- Rio marker updated

- After discussing with the Executing Agency, we will be unable to adjust the project duration. The project duration is based on the GEF grant amount and co-financing secured. The EA cannot extend the project without additional funds.

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

Component 1 seems to involve investment, beyond TA, as it states 'pilot' in the description. Please reconsider or provide rationale for selecting TA for Component 1.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 04/12/2022:

Component 1 changed to investment.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

In few letters provided as an evidence, different types of co-financing, such as in-kind or loan, are indicated in the same letter (e.g., ICADE and CATIE), which does not match with what is indicated in CEOAR. For example, co-financing from CATIE should mention in-kind contribution and loans separately in CEOAR as indicated in its letter.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 04/12/2022:

Co-financing table updated.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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.

Agency Response
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

We note there is no PPG requested. If PPG is requested, please indicate this in the PIF.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 04/12/2022:

we confirm that no PPG will be requested

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

- There seems to be significant gender gap in several indicators, including Core Indicators 1 and 4. Please reconsider these indicators or provide justification for this gap.

- The level of result ambition is modest. Please consider opportunities to increase the impact ambition levels for each of the core indicators. For example, for core indicator 1 (beneficiaries), are the current figures considering family members of farmers supported? For core indicator 2 (hectares), is impact on neighboring farms considered?

Agency Response

CI-GEF 04/12/2022:

The project has revised the core indicators.

core indicator 1, we will consider family members of farmers supported. Of the 2,425 direct beneficiaries, each beneficiary represents a family receiving support from Heifer. Each family is comprised of an average of 5 members . This amounts to: $2,425 * 5 = 12,125$ beneficiaries (7,275 women and 4,850 men).

core indicator 2, the total area of land (ha) targeted by the project will be 2,054 ha (1,027 ha in agricultural land and 1,027 ha in rural landscapes).

Core indicator 3, the target remains the same. Project activities will be developed and implemented in a manner that supports and adheres to relevant government adaptation strategies and plans, e.g., National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPA).

Core Indicator 4:, gender gap: the reality is that most farm owners that Heifer works with in both countries are men. To achieve our targets, we must work with men and women in a way that reflects the current gender makeup of the target value chains. To help bridge the gender gap, Heifer will conduct direct outreach with women farm owners and other women working in the target value chains.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

- We note the information on high levels of biodiversity in the focus countries. Please explain the relevance to climate adaptation and resilience in the context of this project.
- It will be important to strengthen the climate adaptation rationale of the project by more explicitly discussing the current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards that will be addressed through this project. In doing so, it would be ideal to briefly consider the impacts of modest and severe climate scenarios (if possible drawing on exiting available information to refer to RCP 4.5 and 8.5 to 2050), to consider the extent of anticipated impacts, and therefore how the project will address them.

Agency Response

04/12/2022:

- additional BD information removed.
- Climate change adaptation rationale strengthened throughout the document. The current and anticipated risks to both Guatemala and Honduras were included and the ways in which the project addresses climate change is included (see 1-a Global adaptation problems and Section 6 Risk section (yellow highlights))

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.26.2022:

Cleared.

04.25.2022:

Please reflect the response on carbon emissions (e.g., how to quantify the impact, carbon emissions reduction target, if any etc.) to CEOAR (or please highlight the change if this is already in CEOAR).

04.19.2022:

- Please reflect the response made in the review sheet on 'AEI in a different context' in CEOAR (or highlight the changes if this has been done). Also, please deepen the discussion on the impact on the CO2 emissions - for example through 'energy efficient drying systems' etc. Is the project expected to increase/decrease CO2? If so how and how much etc.?

- Please clarify the value chains to be addressed. Some sentences mention four value chains; i.e., cardamom, allspice, coffee, and cocoa, while others mentions three including 'Component 3: Pilot AEI ? integrate AEI into three premium value chains'

03.28.2022:

- Components 1 and 2: Please elaborate further on the linkage between Components 1 and 2. While Component 1 is the largest Component in terms of \$, the key uniqueness of

this project? AEI, will be developed under Component 2. While the CEOAR states ?in order for the AEI to be developed, appropriate climate smart practices must be first implemented and monitored in target communities in the project areas.? Please further elaborate on this statement, in particular what information/data etc. from Component 1 are feeding to what activities etc. in Component 2 (and/or 3) and how are they benefitting. This linkage is not also clear in the TOC.

- Output 1.1.2: While technologies, tools, and skills to be introduced might be determined during the project implementation, please provide candidate or examples so that we can have a better image of the pilots.

Indicator 1.2b # of producers that have higher incomes: please also consider actual income \$ compared to the baseline.

- Value chains: Please provide further justification on selecting four value chains - cardamom, allspice, coffee and cacao. Also, do these value chains complete within the boundaries of two countries; that is, are there any possibility that the value chains extending beyond the country boundaries? If that is the case, please elaborate on how this project will ensure that entire value chain is covered beyond the country boundaries or provide rationale for not to cover the entire value chains.

- AEI in a different context: CEOAR states ?the AEI will be able to be modified for and deployed in a variety of contexts once properly developed?. Please elaborate on approach/ideas on this. Current description seems to be too simple considering the importance of capability to adjust and fit to different contents. How can we make sure?

Agency Response

04/26/2022:

Information on quantifying CO2 emissions from drying is highlighted in the CEOAR. In addition, the baseline sections that mention the impact of current drying practices also included.

04/22/2022:

- Text on AEI in a different context included in the portal under the description of Component 2.

- The baseline section describes that poor cultivation practices and inefficient drying processes contribute to generating deforestation of some 4000 hectares (238,000 tons of CO2) a year in the Alta Verapaz area of Guatemala.

Drying is an essential process for the target value chains. Drying facilities in the project areas tend to rely on fuelwood as their primary source of energy. With demand for spices and ethically sourced food products rising during the pandemic, the project will leverage Heifer?s existing partnerships including with McCormick to support targeted infrastructure investments, including in low-carbon, energy efficient drying systems that use electricity and solar energy instead of firewood. The dryers will reduce CO2

emissions, avoid deforestation, and ensure long term economic and environmental sustainability.

During project implementation, the project team will utilize tool(s) such as the FAO EX-ACT Tool to quantify the impact of CO₂ emissions. To calculate this information, the project team will determine the number of ha of forest that are affected because of the use of the drying systems described above. The number of ha will be a subset of the total number of ha that will be managed for climate resilience (i.e., 2,054 ha).

- The proposed project will work in the value chains: of cardamom, allspice, and cocoa in Guatemala, and coffee and cocoa in Honduras (4 value chains in total). However, the AEI will be piloted in three out of the four target value chains.

04/12/2022:

- On the linkages between Components 1 and 2: Small scale producers are forced to make a series of decisions, trade-offs, and adjustments on a regular basis. Approaches to sustainability change as variabilities in climate, markets, and other opportunities fluctuate. It is therefore necessary as part of Component 1 to evaluate the impact of different approaches on resiliency and the ability of farmers to adapt to climate change. For example, farmers growing shade grown coffee face a series of obstacles and opportunities that differ from non-shade grown coffee.

- Output 1.1.2: Examples of technologies, tools, and skills that could encompass the pilots include:

Technologies ? e.g., shade management, pruning, plantation density, pest and disease management, nutrition/fertilization, irrigation, processing of crops, genetic material research, solar-powered drying technology, etc.

Tools ? e.g., Farmer field schools, exchange visits for knowledge sharing, use of drones to measure progress and impacts in Honduras (drones will be purchased through other Heifer projects)

Skills ? e.g., Improved land management/improved production

- Revised indicator to state, # of producers that have higher incomes as a result of their participation in the project (*considering actual income \$ compared to the baseline which is to be determined*)

- The target value chains are fully contained within Guatemala and Honduras. In Honduras, Heifer has 42 years of continuous on-the-ground presence, with eight years working in coffee and cocoa. In Guatemala, Heifer has 52 years of continuous on-the-ground presence, with ten years of experience working in cardamom and five years in allspice. These are economically significant value chains, and Heifer will leverage our

established partnerships and in depth experience and knowledge to ensure applicability of AEI in different countries.

- The AEI is a composite index with a methodology that allows for consideration of a core set of indicators. This core body of indicators can be amended to accommodate different aspects of different value chains. For example, gender would be considered a core indicator that is mandatory across all value chains. Energy efficient drying systems would be an example of adaptation localized to a specific value chain (cardamom).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear

03.28.2022:

Please further elaborate on how each indicator targets were calculated.

Agency Response

04/12/2022: the following text was included in the portal/CEOAP

Core Indicator 1

In both countries, we calculated the number of beneficiaries based on the number of producers that Heifer works with in the selected project areas.

Core Indicator 2

In both countries, we calculated the number of ha based on the number of ha owned by the producers that Heifer works with in the selected project areas.

Core Indicator 3

In both countries, Heifer will deliver activities working together with the respective ministries of environment, both of whom have shared letters of support for this project. Heifer will also work directly with municipal authorities in project areas to build their capacity on adaptation strategies.

Core Indicator 4

The target has been calculated based on Heifer's previous experience working with local communities in the project areas, the project duration, and the project budget.

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear.

03.28.2022:

CEOAR states: ?Though several new forms of adaptation accreditation schemes are simultaneously being developed ? none are yet being developed or implemented in Central America.? How can we ensure that the proposed AEI is different from these and confirm that AEI can be developed and implemented as opposed to them? What were the barriers and limitations to the previous ones and how does AEI overcome these?

Agency Response

04/12/2022:

There are two proposed adaptation accreditation schemes that are in development to our knowledge. The Vulnerability Reduction Credit (VRC) program is designed to offset the impacts of climate change, adjusted for the income levels of communities. This program is aligned with the AEI but is substantially different in that the AEI is a composite index approach as opposed to the VRC which is more linear and designed as an offset as opposed to a portfolio of actions which more accurately reflects on-the-ground realities and allows flexibility for both farmers and end users of the credit. Additionally, the AEI works across value chains rather than exclusively at the individual project level. VRC, as we understand it, is a singular accreditation that does not accommodate other similarly situated certifications. On the other hand, the AEI is compatible with and accounts for other accreditations and offers an umbrella hierarchy that does not discount or compete with other investments but rather builds on those efforts.

Certified Adaptation Benefits (CABs) created by the African Development Bank are a non-market commodity that is intended to represent progress toward resiliency. The credits are project specific and are not subject to trade. CABs are targeted at governments initially. Once the benefits are created and traded, they are surrendered. This vision is in stark contrast to the AEI which is not project-based, is intended as a composite evaluation, and to run at least the length of the commodity production life cycle. The AEI is intended to underpin a new, tradeable, asset class.

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 05.02.2022:

It is well noted that the stakeholder engagement plan includes a detailed description of the stakeholder engagement and consultations process during PPG. However, please provide an overview of these consultations and key findings as well as a summary of how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution in the portal section on stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/25/2022:

Stakeholder engagement during the PPG phase included in the portal and how these stakeholders will be consulted during the implementation phase are included in the portal (yellow highlights)

05/12/2022:

Stakeholder Engagement Plan (table) included in the portal) Yellow highlight on the heading.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear.

03.28.2022:

Please ensure inclusion of a brief (2-4 sentence) explanation about how this project will contribute to climate resilient recovery from the COVID 19 pandemic.

Agency Response 04/12/2022: the following text was included in the CEOAP/portal: In the region, restrictions on mobility and suspension of farming activities have dramatically affected food production systems, making farmers and communities more vulnerable to climate variability stemming from reduced income, increased costs, and disrupted markets. Surveys conducted by CGIAR in 2021 indicate that farmers require increased information, tools, and methodologies for increasing sustainable crop production via adapted production which this project will provide. Additionally, farmers indicate the need for differentiated strategies to enable economic recovery and improved access to markets. These components are central to the proposed body of work.

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.25.2022:

Clear.

04.19.2022:

Please further deepen the discussion on how the experience and capacity to 'execute' projects are shared also with the local institutions and entities, including local ministries etc., if they will not be assigned as 'executing agency'.

03.28.2022:

- Executing Partner:

In general, local partners are more desirable in terms of sustainability of the project. Currently, only Heifer International is listed under Executing Partner(s). Please reconsider or provide justification.

- The impact on institutional arrangements is blurry and hard to read. Please upload a clearer version.

Agency Response

04/22/2022:

While Heifer is the Executing Agency for the project, the project will be closely coordinated with the Ministries of Environment in both countries. Heifer will seek to build the overall capacity of local institutions and entities in both countries to understand the requirements of GEF funding, better understand the broader adaptation funding landscape, and create safeguards plans related to gender mainstreaming, indigenous peoples, accountability and grievance mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement.

Additionally, local institutions and entities will be an integral part of the development of the Adaptation Equivalency Index (AEI) under Component 2. The project team will firstly engage with local institutions and entities in Guatemala and Honduras via in-person and virtual meetings to identify key adaptation metrics. Next, the project team will analyze the adaptation benefits and metrics as identified by local institutions and entities and from the pilot projects and will integrate these into AEI framework and analysis. Finally, the project team will validate the AEI with stakeholders via virtual meetings/webinars that will include stakeholders from local institutions and entities, the private sector, communities, and producers.

04/12/2022:

- Please clarify the first question. The project will be executed by Heifer's offices in Guatemala and Honduras, in close coordination with the Ministries of Environment in both countries.

- institutional arrangements diagram updated

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.11.2022:

Clear.

05.02.2022:

There seems to be a discrepancy between the M&E total in the M&E budget table (\$76,496.50) and the M&E total in overall project budget table (\$48,234). Please double check and correct if required.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/09/2022:

2) The amounts M&E budget table (portal) and M&E in the overall project budget (Table b) match for \$48,234.

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.25.2022:

Cleared.

05.24.2022:

- TOR provided; cleared.

- Office Equipment: The explanation provided in the Review Sheet is not only incomplete as only refers to computers (while the items in question included rent, utilities, and phone and internet which are clearly part of the project's execution), but also cannot be accepted because it says that "The computers under equipment are charged to the components as they are for personnel to use for carrying technical activities on the project." Ultimately all items are for developing technical activities, but these items (computers, rent, utilities, and phone and internet) are essentially associated with the project execution - as such, they have to be covered by PMC. If not possible to cover them with PMC, please cover them with the co-financing resources allocated to PMC.

05.11.2022:

- Project Coordinator + Project Director + Project Lead:

In principle, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by PMC (GEF portion and/or the co-financing portion).

Only in exceptional cases where "clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component" are provided, the project's staff could be charged to the project's components.

05.02.2022:

- Project Coordinator + Project Director + Project Lead have being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 802 K, and there is a co-financing grant of 102 K - this could contribute to cover the costs of the project's staff. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds - which for this projects is not the case), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with "clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component".

- All office equipment should be charged to the PMC portion of the budget.

- The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use

GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/25/2022:

The EA has agreed to co-finance the equipment and other operating costs and the budget has been amended to reflect this change. Please see budget images in the budget section of the portal and budget attached as a separate file.

CI-GEF 05/17/2022:

Thanks for the inputs. The policy states "If project staff are charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat." The project's staff mentioned above are only charging to the components, so we interpreted that including TORs was not necessary. However, we have added the Terms of Reference to the 1-Step document (Annex M of document in portal)

CI-GEF 05/09/2022:

- 1) Stakeholder engagement information included in the portal
- 2) The amounts M&E budget table and M&E in the overall project budget match for \$48,234.
- 3) We have removed the PMC costs from the Project Lead, Contracts and Policy Officer, and Coordinator and reallocated to another function that will deliver on project management. To reflect this update, the role of Project Lead has been modified to Technical Lead. Most of the co-financing for the project is in-kind, the small grant from Heifer is already being used to partially cover project management costs.
- 4) The computers under equipment are charged to the components as they are for personnel to use for carrying technical activities on the project.
- 5) Purchase of the 4 motorcycles and 2 vehicles are covered by co-financing. Only the maintenance/operations costs for \$23,694 are included in the budget. Utilizing project funds for related vehicle costs is essential to the success of the project for personnel to access project site and complete fieldwork.

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Clear.

03.28.2022:

The current OFP of Guatemala is Ms. Jenifer Andrea Calder?n Cintora.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.25.2022:

This CEOAR is recommended for technical clearance.

05.24.2022 /05.11.2022 /05.02.2022 /04.25.2022 /04.19.2022 /03.28.2022:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the updates/changes).

Please address remaining comments in Stakeholder section and Annexes section.

Review Dates

| | 1SMSP CEO Approval | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| First Review | 3/28/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/19/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/25/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/26/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/2/2022 | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations