

Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+) Global

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID 11686
Countries Global
Project Name Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+) Global
Agencies UNDP
Date received by PM 11/13/2025
Review completed by PM
Program Manager Anil Sookdeo
Focal Area Multi Focal Area
Project Type FSP

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

Dec 3, 2025 - The project executing agency is not filled out.

Mar 3, 2026 - comment cleared

April 29, 2026 - Please classify the latest version of the ProDoc (including the updated budget table) as 'Public' so they can be circulated.

Agency Response The executing agency is UNDP and has been entered into the GEF portal.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Dec 3, 2025 - 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?**
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Dec 3, 2025 - Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) 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?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) 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 Dec 3, 2025 - Yes

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 Yes

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal**

- pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?
- d) 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?
- e) 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?
- f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
- g) 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?
- h) 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)?
- i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
- j) 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?
- k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
- l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
- m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Output 3.3. Regional and interregional collaboration strengthened to scale biopesticide availability - Why is this being limited to biopesticides? A broader approach that uses nature based solutions would be more impactful.

Gender and stakeholder involvement are not well articulated in terms of the how, for example, gender responsive actions, will be done. Please, using the gender action plan and stakeholder engagement plan, better frame the activities to ensure gender and stakeholders are well embedded into the activity. In addition, could the Agency please elaborate on the budget allocation for the Gender Action Plan?

March 18, 2026 - Comment Cleared

Agency Response

Output 3.3. and its related activities were designed to support countries in their need to overcome the complexity and lengthy biopesticides registrations processes, which delay product access, and limit incentives for investment in production and distribution.

Activities are mainly linked to support countries regulatory capacities and harmonization in registration, while facilitating investment for production and distribution.

While Output 3.3. is focusing on biopesticides, the remaining Outputs of the project target the availability and introduction of 'alternatives' defined as: system approaches that enhance ecosystem stability and reduce agrochemical use, including agroecology, agroforestry, climate-resilient agriculture, organic and regenerative agriculture, and Integrated Pest Management (IPM). They integrate Indigenous knowledge with modern science. Key aspects are adaptive management to changing conditions and integrating innovation. The use of biopesticides, and as a last resort, the use of low-risk chemicals, is to be seen in the context of these systems.

These alternatives fully align with the broader approach of nature-based solutions.

The activities have been updated to better embed gender and stakeholder engagement based on the Gender Action Plan and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The revisions are indicated in a different color.

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.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is a global coordinating project and therefore is covered by the exception in the GEF guidelines.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- 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 Core Indicators are not required for GCP's

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- 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

As the GCP needs to monitor the program writ large, what are the risks to be expected should the child projects run long on implementation beyond the lifetime of the coordination project? How will these be mitigated?

March 18, 2026 - comment cleared

Agency Response

The following risk and its associated mitigation measures have been added in the Risk Table:

Participating countries may advance at different stages of project implementation. Some Child Projects could experience delays in the effective and timely execution of activities, which may affect overall project commitments and, in turn, delay progress in other countries participating in the FARM+ Program.

To mitigate this risk, the Global PMU and the Global Project Steering Committee will provide continuous feedback and monitor the project results on a regular basis.

The Global Child Project will ensure the application of a harmonized and cohesive monitoring, reporting and evaluation approach at the program as well as its child projects. Furthermore, this approach will include coordination in the delivery of midterm reviews (MTRs) and terminal evaluations (TEs). Regular monitoring of FARM+ program and child project performance will be based on tracking global environmental benefits (GEBs) to be delivered by the program and its child projects, as well as the agreed set of global result indicators, that will track achievement of the program objective, beyond core indicators.

In addition, to the PSC meetings, the Global Child Project will ensure coordination and effective implementation among participating countries through the organization of annual virtual FARM+ Program coordination meeting as well as the organization of virtual periodic thematic working groups

Through this integrated approach, underperforming activities can be identified, and remedial action undertaken, while successful activities can be scaled up and/or replicated.

Additionally, the project structure has been devised to allow for autonomous progress, while allowing knowledge exchange. Thus, delays in a country will not automatically stall progress in other countries.

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?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

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

Please provide a summary in the risk table on risks related to stakeholders and better elaborate on its approach and strategy to engage and consult local communities, associations, affected populations, as well as NGO/CSO, farmer, youth, and women representative organizations (in addition to GIYC and Pesticide Action Network - PAN UK), including their roles related to project components and activities.

March 18, 2026 - Comment addressed

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The inclusion of supporting documents as part of the ESSS is acknowledged. The project ESS risks are classified as Moderate. We appreciate strong engagement of indigenous peoples and integration of indigenous knowledge into project design. The following comments and actions are requested: Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators on integrating Indigenous Peoples governance (number) and security of tenure of indigenous peoples (ha) in addition to number of indigenous knowledges, where relevant.

March 18, 2026 - comment addressed

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

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 please provide brief description of the activities carried out under each expenditure category listed in the PPG report:

Agency Response

Addressed in the CEO ER

26 March

The following detail was included in the CEO ER document:

- ? International Consultants: Support from Gender and Safeguards Specialists for the development of the CEO Endorsement Request
- ? Contractual services ? Individuals: Support from PPG leader, Finance Expert and Operations technical expert for the development of the CEO Endorsement Request
- ? Communic & Audio Visual Equip: Mail services for the PPG leader
- ? Professional Services: Micro assessment for responsible party
- ? Audio Visual&Print Prod Costs: Launch of FARM+ Programme
- ? Training, Workshops and Confer: FARM+ and iCOAST PPG Phase ? In-Person Briefing

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

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

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

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

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?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

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

Geo location: Under annex E, please provide geo-referenced information where the project interventions will take place and fill in the fields with Latitude and Longitude of project activities.

March 18, 2026 - comment cleared

Agency ResponseAddressed in the CEO ER

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 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

The PM costs are being pulled from each component including the PMC. The other posts are justifiable. A bit concerned about the time frame for some of these posts. They are hiring the comms and km posts for duration as well which can be argued but these posts can be staggered. The value per year is low at 28K but can also redound to savings.

Please resubmit a budget table following the GEF budget table format as specified in the GEF Project Cycle Guidelines. We will review and provide our comments upon the revised budget table.

March 23, 2026 -

Institutional Arrangements:

a. Please provide a brief explanation of how the 'Responsible Party 1' will be selected for Component 3, and by what entity 'UNDP' 'PSC' 'PAG'? Please also clarify in the narrative that Responsible Party 1 will execute rather than implement Component 3, as these two words may carry different meaning in the GEF context versus that of the Agency.

b. Please provide basic TORs for the PMU staff in the CEO Endorsement document and/or the Agency procod, as requested in the Guidelines (p. 50, para 4).

Budget table:

a. The cost of personnel is nearly 40% - Global / Regional coordination child projects that are executed by the GEF Agencies in average use 30% for personnel - please adjust.

b. Please note that GEF budget lines must be organized by cost item, not by output or outcome. Please review the budget table and aggregate multiple lines that represent a single cost into a single line. For example, the budget for the Project Coordinator is split into six separate lines as shown below. Please revise the budget table (all categories) with this guidance in mind.

c. The budget line for Grants lists the Responsible Entity as 'RP-1.' This appears to be a reference to a future 'Responsible Party' as referenced in the Institutional Arrangements section. Please confirm and include the abbreviation 'RP-1' in the Institutional Arrangements section so it's clearly linked to the reference in the Budget Table.

d. There are two expenditures of at least \$500,000 referring to KM/comms work that is assigned to the 'Other Operating Costs' category. Please move these costs to an appropriate expenditure category. Presumably, these are services to be procured from contractors (company or individual) or consultants. Please revise.

e. Please clarify what the two Equipment costs for 'mail' are referring to 'is this email? If so, please provide an estimate of the cost breakdown that will be incurred by the Agency to provide email addresses to project personnel. The budgeted cost seems very high. Please also combine the two lines for Adobe licenses into one line and the two lines for 'mail costs' into one line as these should be aggregated per previous guidance.

f. Please provide detailed description in the budget table on the items 'SOP development and country training' - 'Development of one paper per year for 5 years' - 'Develop "shortlisting methodology to be used by country level'

g. We will review and may provide comments upon the revised budget table.

April 15, 2026 - Some comments not addressed

•While most comments provided March 19th were addressed, now that the TORs for project staff have been included, we note that the Project Coordinator's costs are charged across all components and PMC but the TOR for this position focuses mainly on project management, administration, monitoring, budgeting, and reporting. Project Coordinators typically cost around \$450,000, and the Project Assistant normally costs \$150,000. The TOR doesn't justify the budget allocation of the associated costs across components for supposed technical work. Please revise the costs of the Project Coordinator and the Project Assistant accordingly and inform to which activity the remaining amount will be allocated..

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)							Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 5	Sub-Total	M&E		
Grants	3 research grants to support Indigenous Knowledge Research	-	-	150,000	-	-	150,000	-	150,000	RP-1
Subtotal Grants		-	-	150,000	-	-	150,000	-	150,000	
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Project Coordinator	92,250	161,250	64,500	96,750	161,250	916,000	-	1,390,000	UNDP
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	One Project Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	211,675	UNDP
Subtotal Salary and benefits / Staff costs		92,250	161,250	64,500	96,750	161,250	916,000	-	1,601,675	
Contractual Services - Individual	Agri finance Expert	-	444,000	-	-	-	444,000	-	444,000	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individual	Finance Engagement specialist	-	845,000	-	-	-	845,000	-	845,000	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individual	Communication Specialist	-	-	-	-	138,750	138,750	-	138,750	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individual	Knowledge Management Specialist	-	-	-	-	107,815	107,815	-	107,815	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individual	Gender, Stakeholder, Safeguard Specialist	-	-	-	-	111,000	111,000	-	111,000	UNDP
Contractual Services - Individual	M&E Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,940	90,940	UNDP
Subtotal Contractual Services - Individual		-	789,000	-	-	357,565	1,146,565	90,940	1,237,505	
International Consultants	One Policy Advisor Expert to support the development of the Policy Decision Support Toolkit and provide virtual targeted assistance	90,000	-	-	-	-	90,000	-	90,000	UNDP
International Consultants	Technical expert for the development of Agri plastics guidelines	-	19,500	-	-	-	19,500	-	19,500	RP-1
International Consultants	Technical expert for multi-stakeholder dialogues for public/private farmer support systems	-	14,490	-	-	-	14,490	-	14,490	RP-1
International Consultants	Technical expert(s) assistance on pesticide registration	-	6,900	-	-	-	6,900	-	6,900	RP-1
International Consultants	Technical expert to develop technical content guideline on Sustainable Packaging	-	-	54,000	-	-	54,000	-	54,000	UNDP
International Consultants	Technical expert to design of guidelines and compiled information on the FARMA baseline	-	-	-	25,500	-	25,500	-	25,500	UNDP
International Consultants	International Consultants for the MTR	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	UNDP
International Consultants	International Consultant for the TE	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	UNDP
Subtotal International Consultants		90,000	40,890	54,000	25,500	210,390	100,000	-	310,390	

Apr 27, 2026 - While the cost of the Project Assistant was reduced to relatively reasonable level (\$186, 050), the cost of the Project Coordinator remained unaltered (\$645,000), which is extremely high for this position in similar projects,. The Agency justifies this by saying that they amended the TORs - the request is to reduce the cost to a reasonably / comparable-with-similar projects level, which is max. \$450,000.

Agency Response

This point has been discussed with the PM and it was clarified.

26 March

23 APR 2026:

Intituational Arrangements:

a. The Responsible Party 1 will be selected by UNDP under the Collaborative Advantage modality, in adherence to UNDP 's procedures. Main steps include: 1. Identification & Initial Screening; 2. Capacity Assessment; 3. Risk Analysis; 4. Define Requirements; 5. Justification for selection; and 6. Responsible Party Agreement.

The narrative was updated indicating that the RP-1 will execute Component 3.

b. Annex 7: Overview of Technical Consultancies/Subcontracts has now been uploaded.

Budget Table:

a. Cost of personnel was adjusted to 30%.

b. The GEF budget was updated accordingly.

c. Budget account lines under Component 3 were updated indicating ?RP-1? as the Responsible Entity in line with the Institutional Arrangements. In addition, ?RP-1? abbreviation was included in the Institutional Arrangements section.

d. The category was updated to ?Contractual Services ? Company?.

e. Yes, these are mail costs. The estimated cost per person per year was detailed in the description and budget lines were combined in one line.

f. A detailed description was introduced:

- 'SOP development and

country training' : Development of standard operating procedure (SOP) including step-by-step guidance to perform a gap analysis across Child Projects to identify divergences in the maturity of financial interventions, institutional capacities, and enabling policy environments

- 'Development of one paper per year for 5 years': Co-develop thought leadership papers with strategic partners to provide an evidence base to influence global policy dialogues and inform investor decision-making.

- 'Develop "shortlisting

methodology to be used by country level': Develop a shortlisting methodology to be used by country level teams for selection of financing products responding to specific needs of national Child Project (3 stage approach: i) Rapid Feasibility Screening; ii) Scoring-Based Assessment; iii) Guidance for Qualitative Refinement)

23 APR 2026

The TOR for the Project Coordinator has now been revised to reflect the technical support that it will be providing across all the technical components. We have uploaded the updated TOR to the GEF portal. With regards to the costs of the Project Assistant, we have modified the budget to reflect that this position will be shared with the iCOAST Global Child Project. Thus, the total amount for the Project Assistant is \$186,050, which is closer to the range suggested above. This also allowed us to increase the budget allocation for the Project Coordinator within the PMC. The updated budget and documents have also been uploaded.

27 APR 2026:

The cost of the Project Coordinator has been reduced to \$450,000. The remaining amount has been allocated to Contractual Services? to the companies in each of the components.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/9/2026	3/3/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/23/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2026	