

# Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10612

**Countries**

South Africa

**Project Name**

Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/3/2021

**Review completed by PM**

11/10/2022

**Program Manager**

Adriana Moreira

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

FSP

**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

12-22-21: Project is aligned with BD focal area element BD-1-2b: Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Global Wildlife Program.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: The proposed project design is technically sound and activities, outputs and outcomes are well aligned.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**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

12-22-21 All co-financing letters are missing from the CEO Endorsement document in the Portal and could not be found in the other documents attachments (Appendix 12 provides a summary table, but not the actual letters) . Please attach the signed letters for review according to the co-financing policy guidelines. Please also note that when co-financing truly meets the definition of "in kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please revise. The classification of the type of co-financing as "other" should also be explained.

9-8-22: In relation to the co-financing from the Endangered Wildlife Trust (\$274,299) please, change "Other / Recurrent expenditures" to "Grant / Investment Mobilized?". Also, please provide a short summary of activities (e.g., development of monitoring system) under the Investment Mobilized description.

In relation to the ESRI co-financing, please change "Investment mobilized" to "Recurrent expenditures" .

Under the Investment Mobilized description, public sector investment in fencing maintenance and fencing infrastructure upgrades in the prevention component of the HWC Management Framework is noted, but no co-financing entry for this. It appears that this amount can be reported as "Public Investment / Investment Mobilized". Please review the co-financing provided by Department Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment. It may be necessary to create 2 co-financing entries for "in-kind/Recurrent expenditures" and "Public Investment/Investment Mobilized (for the fencing).

|                               |                           |         |                        |                      |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Civil Society Organization    | Endangered Wildlife Trust | Other   | Recurrent expenditures | 274,299.00           |
| Civil Society Organization    | ESRI                      | In-kind | Investment mobilized   | 650,000.00           |
| <b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b> |                           |         |                        | <b>23,532,946.00</b> |

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

Investment Mobilized comprises public sector investment in fencing maintenance and fencing infrastructure upgrades as an investment in the prevention component of the HWC Management Framework. These funds are allocated under the Infrastructure Programme of the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment and under the Presidential Youth Employment Initiative of the Republic of South Africa. The Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Programme (EPIP) is aimed at conserving natural assets and protecting the environment. The purpose of EPIP is to manage the identification, planning and implementation of programmes that mirror and support the mandate of the department whilst at the same time creating job opportunities using labour intensive methods targeting the unemployed, youth, women, people with disabilities and SMMEs.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 4th Nov 2021**

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022**

co-financing from the Endangered Wildlife Trust (\$274,299) has been changed from ?Other / Recurrent expenditures? to ?Grant / Investment Mobilized?

the ESRI co-financing, has been changed from ?Investment mobilized? to ?Recurrent expenditures?

The reference to public sector investment in fencing infrastructure was removed as this was not specified by the DFFE co-finance contribution and was no longer relevant (the statement about fencing was an error as it was a hold-over from an earlier draft in the portal).

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised 22/12/2021**

Co-financing letters are now uploaded in the Portal and are included in Appendix 12. As shown in Appendix 2 (co-finance budget) and Appendix 12, seven organizations have provided co-financing contributions.

The amount of co-financing in table C of the CEO ER is \$23,532,946, which is \$604,946 more than what was estimated at the PIF stage.

?Recurrent expenditures? and ?investment mobilized? and ?other? were reviewed and corrected in the CEO ER.

#### **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

12-22-21: The proposed financing presented in Table D is adequate.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: The status and utilization of the PPG resources is reported in Annex C.

9-8-22: Please include the total for the amount spent to date and the amount committed. It looks like the amount spent to date total 72k and the amount committed 68k so there is a 10k discrepancy. Please revise and correct.

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

| <b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF:</b>                 |                                   |                             |                         |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i> |                             |                         |
|   | <i>Budgeted Amount</i>            | <i>Amount Spent To date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| International consultants                         | 70,000                            | 40,000                      | 30,000                  |
| National consultants                              | 55,000                            | 30,000                      | 15,000                  |
| International Travel                              | 19,000                            | 0                           | 19,000                  |
| Local travel                                      | 3,000                             | 2,000                       | 1,000                   |
| Meetings and workshops                            | 3,000                             | 0                           | 3,000                   |
| <b>Total</b>                                      | <b>150,000</b>                    |                             |                         |

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement/approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement/approval date. Agencies should report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 4th Nov 2021**

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022**

The figures in the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document, have been corrected in both, the portal and the CEO endorsement request

**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

12-22-21: Core indicators are aligned with proposed project activities. Please include the values for PIF stage core indicators as per the Core Indicators worksheet (Appendix 15). We welcome the land-based target of 1,132,722 ha under CI 4.1 landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity. In order to capture the potential multiple benefits, we recommend calculating the GHG mitigation associated to this target. The values for CI 11 increased substantially from PIF Stage, please explain.

9-8-22: Neither the Results Framework in Annex A, nor the M&E Plan, describe the sources and frequency of data collection. Please include these elements either in the current results framework or through a separate M&E framework listing those elements indicator by indicator. This matters as IEO rates M&E at project design stage along these elements. Paragraph 26 on M&E design of Annex 12 of the Project Cycle Guidelines states that: "To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess: Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient? Did it include baseline data? Did it specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results; a proper

methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities??

Agency Response

**Cleared on 4th Nov 2021**

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022**

Annex A of the CEO ER and Appendix 3 (Results Framework) of the prodoc, have been updated with the sources and frequency of data collection as specified under Means of Verification and the Targets and Monitoring Milestones columns. In addition to using the latest available census data, the project will undertake baseline surveys of constituents within 5 km of protected areas in project sites as part of activity 1.1.3 (project start) and activity 2.1.3 (mid-term and end of project).

Annex A in the portal has been updated accordingly

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised 22/12/2021**

Values for PIF stage core indicators in the portal cannot be updated from the Agency side at this stage, because the portal does not permit us to edit PIF stage entries at the CEO endorsement stage.

The values of CI 4.1 and CI 11 increased substantially from PIF stage as a result of consultations undertaken during the PPG phase. The project focuses on 3 landscapes (defined in the documents) that were more carefully mapped during the PPG phase. As these areas are larger than the initial PIF estimates, they encompass larger populations of people, which was assessed using the most recent available census data associated with the polygons in CI 4.1. Accordingly, these are more accurate.

Project consultants examined the applicability of the EX-ACT tools to calculate the GHG mitigation for the GEF7 HWC project. There is a conceptual issue using the EX-ACT tool for this project as it works on the premise that project activities result in a land-use change (e.g., restoration of degraded grassland). However, this GEF-7 project is not designed nor intended to result in a change in land-use, and therefore would not affect the carbon balance. Rather, improved management and mitigation of HWC in the project landscapes would result in their overall improved management. The activities in this GEF-7 project focus on understanding the drivers of HWC, developing innovative solutions, strengthening management capacity, and formulating policy tools. These

activities do not change the potential emissions associated with the 1,132,722 ha under improved management (per CI 4.1).

## **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

12-22-21: The proposal presents satisfactory elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: Baseline scenario and associated projects are adequately described.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Component description and proposed outcomes are satisfactory.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: The proposed project is well aligned with the BD focal areas strategy and the GWP Framework.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

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



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: Incremental reasoning is consistent and technically sound.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Project's expected contributions to Global Environment Benefits are adequately elaborated.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Description of innovation, sustainability and scaling up aspects is adequate.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Maps are satisfactory.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: The proposal is a child project under the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) and it is well aligned with the program's framework, directly contributing to the overall program impact.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Project includes adequate stakeholders engagement plan.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: The project conducted gender analysis and includes gender-sensitive activities and indicators linked with project objectives.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Engagement with private sector is adequately described.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are adequate.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Institutional arrangements are adequate. Coordination with other relevant projects/initiatives is also described.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: The alignment with the national strategies and plans is satisfactorily described.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

12-22-21: Proposed knowledge management approach is adequate.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

### 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

12-22-21: Project includes adequate M&E plan with specific budget.

9=8-22: Please include a budget for M&E in section 9 (which has to match the M&E column budget).

### 9. Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Describe the budgeted M and E plan

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in the project document and its appendix 8, which are consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework (annex A) includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in the project document appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. This includes the means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget. Annual Project Implementation Reports will be filed. A mid-term and end of project evaluations will be conducted by UNEP's Evaluation Office.

4-11-22: the Review Sheet mentions that the *the M&E budget has been included in section 9 of the CEO ER?*, but the M&E budget table is still is not presented in Section 9, so one cannot assess the activities / expenditures charged to M&E. Please, amend and resubmit.

## 9. Monitoring and Evaluation

### Describe the budgeted M and E plan

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive project reporting requirements are summarized in the project document and its appendix 8, which are consistent with the Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework (annex A) includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome, as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in document appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are achieved. This includes the means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators. M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget. Annual Implementation Reports will be filed. A mid-term and end of project evaluations will be conducted by UNEP's Evaluation Office.

## 10. Benefits

11-14-22: While M&E Budget was included in Portal, there is one activity wrongly included in the M&E budget that needs to be charged to PMC. The activity wrongly included is "Audits" (\$47,000). Please, amend and also, adjust the amounts in Table B and in the Budget table accordingly.

### Agency Response

#### Response to 4th GEF review of 14 Nov 2022

The M&E budget, Table B and in the Budget table have been adjusted in relation to the audit costs.

#### Response to 3rd GEF review of 4 Nov 2022

The M&E budget table is now included in section 9 of the CEO ER and also in the portal.

#### Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022

The M&E budget has been included in section 9 of the CEO ER, as recommended, and the M&E column costs shown in the project budget (appendix 1) are consistent with the M&E costed budget (appendix 7).

### 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  
 12-22-21: Socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response Cleared on 22 Dec 2021  
 Annexes

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
 12-22-21: Please attach a detailed budget table to Annex E of the CEO Endorsement document.

9-8-22: On Table B and the project budget table: there seems to be a 30k difference between the total of Component 3 and the total for PMC from Table B to the project budget table provided in Annex E. Please, review and correct.

|  |                      |                                      |   |                      |                   |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| Component 3: Harmonized                | Technical Assistance | Outcome 3: Transboundary movement of | Output 3.1: Guidelines and toolkits for the | GET                  | 1,538,2           |
| <b>Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ</b> |                      |                                      |   |                      |                   |
|  |                      |                                      |   | GET                  | 133,237.00        |
|  |                      |                                      |   | <b>Sub Total(\$)</b> | <b>133,237.00</b> |

On Project Manager: Project Manager is 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 (Project Management Costs). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.17 million, but all is in-kind. In these cases, TORs that show the deliverables charged to the specific components are necessary and should be part of the CEO Endorsement package. Please include the TORs and resubmit.

| code                               | UNEP budget line                        | C1   | C2        | C3        | M&E | PMC     | Total   |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-----------|-----------|-----|---------|---------|
| <b>Appendix 1. GEF-UNEP Budget</b> |   | <b>See appendix 1b for explanations + totals by agency</b> |           |           |     |         |         |
| UNEP budget line                   |   | Expenditures by outcome/component                          |           |           |     |         |         |
|                                    |   | Outcome 1  | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3 | M&E | PMC     | Total   |
| 10                                 | PERSONNEL COMPONENT                     |  |           |           |     |         |         |
| 1100                               | Project personnel                       |  |           |           |     |         |         |
| 1101                               | Project Manager/HWC Specialist by DFFE. | 12,573   | 21,875    | 67,772    |     | 163,237 | 265,457 |

Agency Response

**Cleared on 4th Nov 2021**

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022**

On table B, the \$30k difference (error) has been corrected to \$1,508,226. The PMC cost has been updated in the portal from \$133,237 to the correct amount of \$163,237.

On Project Manager: The TORs for the project manager are included in Appendix 11 and re-submitted. The project manager is a technical specialist and undertaking activities in support of the three components; accordingly, the allocation is in proportion to the budgets of the three components.

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised 22/12/2021**

The full budget is now uploaded in annex E in the portal.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: Project results framework is satisfactory. However, all core indicators targets estimated at PIF stage are not reported in the Portal. Please revise and adjust accordingly.

9-8-22: The Results Framework Table including assumptions is off the margins ? this will impede any reader to see the complete information whenever the auto-generated Portal view is downloaded during circulation. Please, adjust and resubmit.

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

This results framework should be read together with the Theory of Change (section 3.4.1), drivers and assumptions (section 3.4.2) and risks (section 3.5.1), which give consideration to COVID-19 and climate change factors that may pose a risk to project outcomes. To aid in the review of this document, the assumptions and risks have been copied to the bottom of this appendix.

| Project Objective (PO)   | Indicators  | Baseline | Targets and Monitoring Milestones  | Means of Verification | Assumptions (section 3.4.2)   |
|--|---|----------|--|-----------------------|---|
| To create an enabling environment and evidence-based approach for managing the effects of human-wildlife conflict in selected conservation landscapes in South Africa and TFCAs of southern Africa | <u>GEF Core Indicator 4.1:</u>  | 0        | <u>Mid-term:</u>   | Project reports.      | Assumptions: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8<br><br>Risks: 2, 3, 4, 9, 14, 15<br><br>Notes on indicator:<br><br>• For this indicator, the 'improved management' are the 'conservation landscapes' (section 3.4.1) in the 5 km buffer around the PAs in the three project landscapes (excluding PAs).<br><br>• 'Improved management' are implemented through the following management improvements: fence maintenance; fence repairs; fence inspections/excursions; number of fence inspections/excursions reported; time it took to |
|  | CI 4.1<br><br>Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (ha) (non-PAs) |          | 755,148 ha (this represents 50% of the focal landscape area in the 5 km buffer around the PAs in the three project landscapes (excluding PAs).<br><br><u>End of project:</u><br><br>1,132,722 ha (this represents 75% of the focal landscape area in the 5 km buffer around the PAs in the three project landscapes (excluding PAs). |                       |   |

Agency Response  
Cleared on 4th Nov 2021

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised on 8th Sept 2022**

The margins have been adjusted and re-submitted (this is also appendix 3 of the project document).

**Response to the GEFSEC Review comment raised 22/12/2021**



All core indicators targets estimated at the PIF stage are now reported in the revised version on the portal.

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

##### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: Please respond to the comments above, revise and resubmit the CEO Endorsement package for further review. Thanks!

9-9-22: Please address the comments above and resubmit for review. Thanks!

4-11-22: The M&E budget table is still not presented in Section 9 , as required. Please, amend and resubmit.

11-14-22: Please, refer to the comment above on the need to adjust the M&E budget, Table B and in the Budget table in relation to the audit costs. Please, amend and resubmit. Thanks!

#### Agency Response

##### **Response to 4th GEF review of 14 Nov 2022**

The M&E budget, Table B and in the Budget table have been adjusted in relation to the audit costs.

##### **Response to 3rd GEF review of 4 Nov 2022**

The M&E budget table is now included in section 9 of the CEO ER and also in the portal.

**23/08/2022**

All comments above have been addressed and the respective documents have been amended as required (e.g., CEO ER, project document, appendices).

In the CEO ER, corrections to co-financing were made in tables A, B, C.

In the Project Document, corrections to co-financing were made in sections 1.11 and 7.2, and Appendix 12.

#### **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 12-22-21: The status and utilization of the PPG resources is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-22-21: Maps are satisfactory.

Agency Response **Cleared on 22 Dec 2021**

**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

N/A

**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 N/A

**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 N/A

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Review Dates**

|   | <b>Secretariat Comment at<br/>CEO Endorsement</b> | <b>Response to<br/>Secretariat<br/>comments</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <b>First Review</b>                         |   | <b>12/22/2021</b>                               |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> |   | <b>9/8/2022</b>                                 |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> |   | <b>11/4/2022</b>                                |

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**11/14/2022**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**