



Biosecurity Implementation Framework for the Management of Biological Resources in Moldova

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10982

Countries

Moldova

Project Name

Biosecurity Implementation Framework for the Management of Biological Resources in Moldova

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/30/2023

Review completed by PM

11/9/2023

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/8/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. 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 JS 11/8/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 11/8/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 11/8/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/8/2023 -

1- Please correct the typo below as the PPG requested is \$ 44,793 USD and not 50K.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
1202 Engagement of International Consultants	15,000	15,000	0
2101 Implementation of national activities	29,739	19,000	10,739
Total	44,739	34,000	10,739

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required
true

PPG Amount (\$) PPG Agency Fee (\$)
44,793 4,255

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	Moldova	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	44,793	4,255	49,048.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					44,793.00	4,255.00	49,048.00

2- Please include details on the activities implemented through PPG funding. Currently only see broad categories are reported on (i.e. implementation of national activities).

Agency Response

11/22/2023

1. Typo corrected
2. Details of activities undertaken during PPG are included in the updated Annex C
ng PPG are included in the updated Annex C

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 -

As stated in the PIF review sheet at the time of approval, the ability of the project to have a direct impact over its lifetime on the hectares reported on core indicator 4 was to be reassessed at CEO approval stage.

None of the outputs and activities include any direct implementation on the ground. All environmental benefits of this project focusing on the policy and institutional frameworks will be indirect. As core indicators are meant to capture direct impact, please either delete the targets reported under core indicators 3 and 4, or explain, with a clear link to specific output and activities how the project is to have any direct impact on the ground in terms of land restoration and improved practices.

Agency Response

11/22/2023

Guidance is noted. The core indicator worksheet has been updated and focused on Core Indicator 11, references to Core Indicators 3 and 4 has been deleted as expected deliverables will have more indirect than direct and measurable impacts in the absence of direct pilot activities

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/7/2023 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 11/29/2023

2- Thank you for the revisions, however:

2a - What is rightfully presented in annex L1 as multiple, separate activities per output with clear deliverables for each activity, is presented as one activity with many subactivities per output in the portal entry. To avoid the confusion, please either reproduce the same activity numbering in the portal as in annex L1 or remove all activity numbering in the portal entry.

2b- The activities pasted in the portal do not match with the outputs. For instance activities under outputs 1.2 and 2.1 are identical (when they are under output 2.1 only as per annex L1), the activities pasted under output 1.1 should have been pasted under 1.2, etc. Please revise and ensure consistency with annex L1.

The rest is cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 -

1- When it should consist in a streamlined description of the Theory of change, the beginning of this section contains many repetitive or misplaced information and some incorrect characterization, e.g.:

- the beginning of subsection 2.1 is almost entirely focused on IAS and incorrectly describe the project objective when the project is about an integrated framework for IAS and LMO, with no output dedicated to directly enhancing ecosystem integrity or functionality in specific sites

2.1 Project Objective

The **goal of the project** is to safeguard globally significant biodiversity in vulnerable ecosystems through the prevention, control, and management of invasive alien species (IAS) in the Republic of Moldova. The project will ensure that Moldova transitions into a sustainable sound management of

The project is focused on two critical results: i) Minimizing the number of unintended and intended IAS introductions to the Republic of Moldova; ii) enhancing ecosystem integrity and functionality of selected sites in the high priority landscapes via IAS control-led restoration. Under the first, the

- Detailed information and maps from another project are provided (GEF/UNDP project ?Conservation and sustainable management of wetlands with focus on high-nature value areas in the Prut River basin?) with no clear reason.

- It mentions demonstration activities related to "improving wetlands condition with the introduction of new species"

- the incremental cost reasoning is duplicative of the dedicated section

Please revise to provide focused description of the ToC with a single, consolidated narrative, and without overpromising on what a \$1 million project dedicated to the enabling environment for LMO and IAS management can directly deliver.

2- Activities should break down their parent outputs into concrete, specific, directly actionable interventions. The document currently includes one "activity" per output that is rather a general elaboration on what the output intends to achieve, instead of a clearly identified intervention that the project will carry out to deliver on these aspirations. We note annexes L1 and L2, which provide more detailed activities, but these are not reflected and do not seem entirely consistent with the main text. Please revise.

Agency Response

12/04/2023

2a. The portal entry has been edited with data from Annex L1 with same activity numbering.

2b. The activities in the portal are matched with the outputs guided by the data in Annex L1 to ensure consistency.

11/23/2023

1. 1. The Project objective (2.1), project components and objectives have been reviewed and updated as per the guidance provided in the review. The TOC, the project components, outcomes and activities have been reviewed and updated to show linkages and clarity in the intervention.

2.

2. The section on project objective and components have been reviewed with activities incorporated guided by the information provided in Annexes L1 and L2. The prodoc has been reviewed and updated to focus primarily on the objective and expected deliverables of the project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 -

Please remove the repetitions and all language that is not related to the two specific entry points of the BD FA strategy used by this project. In particular, please remove the references to FOLUR.

Agency Response

11/22/2023

Repetitive text and language not related to the two specific entry points have been removed. References to FOLUR has been removed. Key changes and inputs are highlighted in green

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared. A map and coordinates of the entire country are provided, since this project does not have on-the-ground interventions.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 -

1- The table corresponding to the stakeholder engagement plan is off margins. Please adjust in the portal.

2- Please elaborate further on the specific stakeholder organizations (not just stakeholder groups) in the plan and also provide further information related to their specific role linked to project components.

Agency Response

11/23/2023

1. 1. The table referring to stakeholder engagement plan has been adjusted in the Portal submission

2.

2. Specific Stakeholder organisations, their participation and roles are captured under Section 3 specifically 3.1 and Table 4, this will be continuously reviewed and updated during implementation. Additional inputs can be found on stakeholder organisations and their roles under Implementation arrangements and coordination

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

JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 - We note the budget Gender Action plan provided as annex P of the ProDoc.

1- Please ensure under Output 4.2 that gender considerations are captured.

2- Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted, monitored and reported on.

Agency Response

1. 1. Output 4.2 has been updated to capture gender considerations

2.

2. The Gender Action plan under Annex P is budgeted and will be reported on. Annex J has been updated to ensure gender issues are monitored and reported on.

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response
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

JS 11/29/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared. We note the timeline for deliverables provided in annex L2 of the ProDoc.

2 - Please briefly describe the communication strategy for the project. Also please clarify the budget and implementation timeline for key KM&L and communications activities/deliverables. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM&L section.

Agency Response

11/23/2023

The communication strategy is described under project component 3 and further elaborated and updated under the KM & L section in a tabular format under Section 6 on Knowledge Management

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared. We note the Low Risk rating and attached SRIF.

Agency Response
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

JS 12/7/2023 - Cleared, an M&E budget slightly above the 5% indicative threshold is well justified.

JS 11/29/2023 -

2- The response is noted. However, please reduce the budget to the indicative threshold of 5% of the GEF-funded part of project financing for projects up to USD 5 million or justify above-average M&E costs for this project. Please note that some items charged on M&E in annex E do not seem to be M&E activities (gender training, inception workshop).

The rest is cleared.

JS 11/9/2023 -

1 - We note the costed M&E plan provided as annex J of the ProDoc but please include it in the portal entry, including a detailed M&E budget.

2- The proposed M&E budget is \$64,000, which is above the indicative threshold of 5% of the GEF-funded part of project financing for projects up to USD 5 million. Please justify the specific M&E needs for this project or revise to ca. \$40,000. In particular, it is unclear what will be the added-value of a MTE for a 36-month project.

Agency Response

12/04/2023

2-The M & E budget has been reduced to \$50,000. Due to the total GEF STAR allocation, it is extremely difficult to reduce to within the indicative threshold. The Budget has been reduced to the barest minimum with Mid Term Review to be done mainly as a desk review and an allocation for monitoring of indicators etc. The updated and costed M & E table is as shown below:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time Frame	Indicative Budget (\$)	
			GEF	Co-finance

Monitoring and Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF Core Indicator Worksheet) and monitoring of ESS	PMU under guidance of UNEP, with inputs from Project Steering Committee (PSC) ,National Project Coordinator (NPC) and designates national experts/consultants and r	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project progress/ perform. Indicators: Annually	10,000	40,000
Project implementation reports (PIR) to UNEP	PMU under guidance of PSC	Annually, part of reporting routine		10,000
Monitoring visits to field sites	PMU, NPC and designated national experts	As appropriate		50,000
Mid Term Review	UNEP	Mid Term of the Project	10,000	40,000
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP	Within 6 months of end of project implementation	30,000	40,000
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	PMU	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report		40,000
TOTAL			50,000	220,000

11/23/2023

1. 1. Costed M & E plan has been incorporated in the prodoc and updated in the Portal entry.
2. 2. Based on experience working in Moldova and the fact that issues of Biosecurity in terms of the conceptual framework for the project, it is extremely important that we keep the allocation for Mid Term review to ensure that interventions are made to assess project, assess any potential challenges and develop adaptive management responses including review and update of core indicator and gender related data at mid-term and plan remedial actions as applicable. The guidance from the UNEP Evaluation Office is to ensure that provision is made for all MSPs with execution period of more than 2 years for at least a Mid Term Review

as a best practice. UNEP suggests that the allocation be kept and further reviewed during implementation

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

JS 11/9/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/7/2023 - Cleared.

JS 11/29/2023

1b - Please see comments on M&E budget and correct.

The rest is cleared.

JS 11/9/2023

1- Budget

1a- The budget is slightly off-margin in the portal, and the font is too small to be readable. Please correct. Columns related to breakdown by project year can be removed from the portal entry to enable an increase in font size.

1b- Please see comments on M&E budget and correct.

1c- Please delete the budget lines for pilot sites as no pilot sites are mentioned in any output or activities:

	1603 Travel related to pilot site activities	10,000	10,000	10,000
2100	Sub-contracts (MOUs/LOAs for cooperating agencies)			
2101	Pilot site project staff			6,000
2102				

1d- Please clarify what is the lab equipment to be purchased and for which entity(ies):

4200	Non-expendable equipment	
4201	Laboratory Equipment	100,000

Agency Response

12/04/2023

1b. omments on M & E budget addressed under the M & E Section of the review

1a. The budget has been adjusted with the margins of the portal entry and guidance provided on detail is appreciated. The full budget template is uploaded as Annex 1-1 under the project documents.

1b- Comments on M & E have been addressed.

1c- The budget lines for pilot site activities have been deleted as guided and references to pilot sites removed from the project document

1d- Please clarify what is the lab equipment to be purchased and for which entity(ies): The narrative under Activity 2.1 in the Section on Project Objective and Outcomes have been updated with a list of equipment, the entity involved, the envisaged responsibilities and cost of the equipment and testing kits. The information on Laboratory equipment is as summarized below. The same is captured in the CEO endorsement template as Table 3 under Activity 2.1

LABORATORY EQUIPMENT			
Equipment	Cost	Designated Institution (Responsible Entity)	Envisaged Roles
Fluorescent Quantitative PCR Machine MSLPCR04 + kit	USD 34,000	Molecular Biology laboratory, National Safe Food Agency (ANSA), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry	Detection and identification of LMOs used in agriculture and food/feed Development of testing Protocols
Fluorescent Quantitative PCR Machine MSLPCR04 + kit	USD 33,000	National Authority for Meteorology and Environmental Monitoring, Ministry of Environment	Detection and identification of LMOs/IAS in the Environment Monitoring of LMOs and Invasive Alien Species using Real Time PCR Testing Methodologies

Fluorescent Quantitative PCR Machine MSLPCR04 + kit	USD 33,000	State University of Moldova with the affiliated research institutes - Institute of Botany, Institute of Zoology	Detection and identification of IAS plants and animals Development of Real Time PCR based Protocols and Testing Methodologies
Total	USD 100,000		

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/7/2023 - Cleared.

We note the improvements but the Results Framework is still not fully implementation ready. Please review the Results Framework at the very first stage of implementation to ensure all indicators are SMART, and are underpinned by a clear monitoring framework, with clear definitions on what and how to measure.

JS 11/29/2023

2- Thank you for the response. However, the question related to the need for indicators in the Results Framework to be SMART, and most notably measurable, with corresponding specific, concrete targets. In the proposed Results Framework many indicators are in the form of number of [...] but associated baselines and targets are not numbers. Some targets are actually outcomes (e.g. the outcome indicator target for outcome 2a "Increased capacities for monitoring, undertaking surveillance and early detection of IAS/LMOs.") rather than specific targets linked to a SMART indicator. For instance, in the case of outcomes related to capacity building, indicators that could be contemplated could relate to a score on some form of tailored capacity assessment, with a numerical baseline and associated targets in the form of X% increase in score.

Please revise the Results Framework with SMART indicators and concrete associated targets at mid-term and end of project, and adequate means of verification. We note that most baselines will not have be available at CEO endorsement stage.

Please ensure that they are fully established in the very first phase of project implementation.

3- We understand core indicator 11 has been broken down in different parts that add up to the total target reported at the project level in the GEF core indicator table. However, for clarity, please include the core indicator, i.e. the number of direct beneficiaries, with a total target of 1,200, as an indicator of progress towards the project objective. The breakdown per

outcome may be kept by further defining what beneficiaries mean under each outcome/component.

The rest is cleared.

JS 11/9/2023

1- Please see comment on core indicators and remove targets related to pilot sites and on-the-ground impact as, to our understanding, there are no project activities that would yield such results:

Output 2.2 National institutional arrangements for LMO and IAS decision-making (authorization) check points, emergency responses, guidance and manuals strengthened/developed	Number of specific regulations, guidelines and manuals on monitoring and detection of IAS and LMOs developed and available. Number of national laboratories in	The new Law on Regulation and control of GMOs/2022 has a specific article on identification and detection of LMOs, as well as packaging, traceability and labelling LMOs requirements.	By end of this project at least 50% of degraded land at project pilot sites are restored.	- M & E reports by PCU, PSC, are available -Progress half year and annual reports submitted to the UNEP, Project closure re	1. Assumptions: -Appropriate biosecurity tools and resources are available for the restoration of degraded lands	2B, 2C
--	---	--	---	---	---	--------

2- Several outcome indicators are related to capacity or awareness. Please clarify how the project intends to measure increased capacity or awareness in practice.

3- Please add explicitly all GEF core indicators on which the project has a target, and their targets, in the Results framework. We note an indicator with a formulation close to GEF core indicator 11 is included (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment), but the target does not appear in the Results Framework.

4- The Results Framework is slightly off-margin in the portal. Please correct.

Agency Response

12/04/2023

2. The results framework has been reviewed and updated as per the review comment

3. Core Indicator 11 has been reviewed and updated as an indicator of progress towards the project objective. Other references have been deleted.

11/23/2023

1- The core indicators 3 and 4 have been removed. Targets related to pilot sites have been removed from the Project Results Framework in Annex A.

2- The project will capture lessons and best practices through the monitoring interventions, the deliverables in Annexes L1 and L2 through periodic assessment, period surveys and knowledge baseline levels at start, mid term and end of the project. The data will be captured

through the monitoring indicators under Annex J, and periodic assessment of pre and post capacity or awareness activities. The platform for knowledge management will be a resource and repository for capturing such information to allow for updates, periodic retrofitting and updates.

3- The expected data on Core Indicator 11 has been captured under the project results framework. All other references to Core indicators 3 and 4 have been deleted as per the review comments.

4- The Results Framework has been adjusted to fit within the margins of the Portal.

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 JS 11/9/2023

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 11/9/2023

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

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/7/2023 - The project is recommended for clearance.

JS 11/29/2023 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 11/9/2023 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	11/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/29/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations