

Achieving a rapid decarbonization of the energy sector in Saint Kitts and Nevis

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10856

Countries

St. Kitts and Nevis

Project Name

Achieving a rapid decarbonization of the energy sector in Saint Kitts and Nevis

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

2/13/2023

Review completed by PM

4/5/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the project remains aligned with the PIF.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, this has been provided and the project design is appropriate.

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 N/A

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




EBF 4/3/2022:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. We note that the co-finance letters have been uploaded to the documents section of the proposal. Please also attach the co-financing letters as evidence in the portal version of the proposal as indicated in the screen capture below:

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type ⓘ

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Climate Action and Constituency Empowerment	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	595,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	10,500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport	In-kind		25,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				11,120,000.00	

2. In both co-financing letters it is stated that *"The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis notes that this letter of co-finance is not a legal commitment."* We kindly ask you to review these co-finance letters and amend, if possible.
3. In addition, the co-financing letter from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport doesn't specify when the co-finance contribution will occur. Please amend.
4. Regarding the in-kind co-finance contribution from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport, please fill the blank with

"recurrent expenditure".

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type ⓘ

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Climate Action and Constituency Empowerment	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	595,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	10,500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Energy, Utilities and Domestic Transport	In-kind		25,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				11,120,000.00	

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Done.

2. Done.

3. Done.

4. Done.

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 EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, this is a cost-effective approach. Although the amounts allocated for components have slightly changed compared to the PIF, the total project cost remains the same.

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

EBF 4/5/2023:

1. Cleared

EBF 4/3/2022:

1. Thank you for the clarification. The unassigned amount in the table is \$325,000. This may probably be a typo (is the correct amount \$25,000?). Please review and correct.
2. Cleared

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please clarify what 'Unassigned' entails.
2. If possible, please specify how the 'uncommitted' amount of US\$ 25,129 is expected to be spent

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

A detailed breakdown of the use of PPG finances for supporting PPG activities may be found in the following table:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF Amount (US\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent to date	Amount Committed
GEF consultant	30,000	30,000	0
GEF consultant travel	5,000	4,871	0
Unassigned	35,000	0	0
Total	60,000	34,871	0

Funds not spent and not committed = 60,000 – 34,871 = USD 25,129.

The unspent of balance of USD 25,129 will spent during project execution, as per the GEF policy: *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.*

- 3.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Apologies for the lack of clarity. Unassigned means that the funds were not committed yet. We discovered that the unassigned amount noted in the budgeted amount column was incorrect. This was corrected in the document.
2. Information added to the document.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Core indicator 11 remains the same compared to the PIF stage. The changes in the core indicator 6 are reasonable. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, this has been provided. 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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Thank you for the clarification, very relevant! Cleared.
3. Noted. Cleared.
4. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please fix Table 5 since some header text overlaps and is difficult to read.
2. Although it is not explicitly mentioned in the text, one can deduce that WindWatt is in charge of the 2.2 MW of wind capacity. Is this right? Can you please elaborate on the experience of the first and only Power Purchase (PPA) in the country? Are there special considerations or experiences to highlight? Is it possible to replicate further PPAs or similar mechanisms?
3. Regarding the subsection "Sources of renewables and their integration into the grid", it focuses on the geothermal potential. Considering that the country also has wind and solar projects installed, we encourage you to provide a brief remark related to the

deployment and potential for scaleup of wind and solar energy (or other relevant renewable energy sources) under the baseline scenario.

4. Please explain what "NIA" (Nevis Island Administration) stands for the first time it is mentioned.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Done.

2. WindWatt is in charge of operating the small wind park on Nevis (2.2 MW). The experience from the PPA showed that sales were much higher than expected and the reliability has been inconsistent, especially in the last 5 or 6 years. This apparently is due to poor maintenance of the turbines. This was clarified in the CEO document. The energy unit and the utilities have in recent years further investigated to the possibility of new PPAs. Most recently, a 35 MW large-scale PV plant on St. Kitts was under consideration but has not materialised yet. For new PPAs, the procurement process needs to be more competitive and the scale needs to be taken into consideration as smaller projects result in higher tariffs. St. Kitts and Nevis is prioritizing the exploration of the geothermal resources and the promotion of innovative integrated utility service models at this point in time, as those of most relevance and potential for the country to achieve its long-term decarbonization targets. Through outputs 1.1 and 1.2, amongst others, the country will consider all options for achieving of such, including PPAs.

3. Additional information on other renewable energy potentials have been added to the subsection "Sources of renewables and their integration into the grid".

4. Done.

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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Noted. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
4. Cleared.
5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
6. Noted. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Considering that Outcome 1 aims to implement a policy and regulation framework for achieving its vision of 100% renewable electricity generation and 100% high energy efficiency public buildings and that this is a critical element of the project, we encourage you to review the ambition of Outputs 1.1. and 1.4, so they develop and adopt the revised National Energy Policy and Federal Energy Efficiency Act, respectively.
2. Considering that one of the main barriers relates to financing, please explain how the revised National Energy Policy will be able to attract and secure the necessary investments. Please provide a clear link between Components 1 and 3.
3. Regarding Output 2.1, please briefly explain why these 7 buildings have been chosen. The project proposal mentions that "[...] level I, II and III energy audits [were executed] for 35 facilities owned by the government in 2018." Later, it mentions that "During the 2018 energy audits on which the pilots are based, it was assessed that similar measures could be applied in at least 16 main administrative buildings throughout the country (7 are addressed under the pilots)".
4. Can you elaborate on the interventions that will be conducted as part of Output 2.1(e.g., type, scale, potential savings, estimated budget)?
5. Please elaborate on how much is expected to be leveraged with a \$100,000 seed capital contribution in Output 3.3.
6. As mentioned in sub-barrier 3.3, "The public sector has limitations on financing energy efficiency measures due to limitations on public spending and restrictions on committing to additional loans (due to the financial situation of the country). " How will Output 3.3 address the previous statement?

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Thanks for the comment. In UNEP we follow the UNEP harmonized results based approach in which outputs are defined as the availability (for intended beneficiaries/users) of new products and services and/or gains in knowledge, abilities and awareness of individuals or within institutions. For example, access by the intended user to a report; new knowledge held by a workshop participant at the end of a training event; heightened awareness of a serious risk among targeted decision-makers. Outputs 1.1 and 1.4 are aligned with this definition in making available to the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis policies for their consideration and adoption. In accordance with UNEP definitions, an outcome is the use of an output by intended beneficiaries, observed as a change in institutions or behaviours, attitudes or conditions. An outcome depends on the realisation of assumptions and drivers as well as the mitigation of risks, which are to a certain point beyond the project's control. I.e. a GEF project can support governmental decision-making and adoption processes but it does not have control over them. Deliverables 1.1.6 and 1.4.4 were developed with that aim. Similarly, indicators 1.1 and 1.2 of annex A ensure that Government decision-making processes consider the policy packages of the two mentioned outputs with a view to achieving adoption.

In this context, the titles of these outputs have been kept as they are. This is a common approach used across UNEP GEF projects.

2. Done. Text added to output 1.1 to clarify.

3. The energy audit study prepared in 2018 investigated the potential energy enhancement potentials and measures (EEM and renewable energies) for 16 public buildings and 19 water pumping station on both islands (see Table 6 of the CEO document). During the PPG phase and the stakeholder consultations, the 7 public buildings were identified as being most promising and desired by the stakeholders to be addressed under the pilots taking into account the following reasons: 1) focus on public buildings instead water pumping stations, 2) high-visibility of selected public buildings, 3) equal spread over both island, 4) priorities of the utilities and the ministries, 5) replication potential and spill over effects to other buildings (residential and commercial). Detailed descriptions of each pilot, including estimated energy savings and technical details are contained in Annex R. This text has been added to output 2.1.

4. Detailed descriptions of each pilot, including estimated energy savings and technical details are contained in Annex R.

5. The capital will help consolidate and initiate the IUS model while ongoing discussions and loans with CCREEE and financial institutions crystalize. With the seed funding the utilities will be enabled to start directly implementing first sub-project under the finance window. Out of the remaining 9 public buildings seven buildings require investment cost of less than USD 100,000 for energy efficiency measures (investment / measure cost for the remaining 9 public buildings assessed in 2018 through energy audits, see Table 6 and Annex R). With the initial investments covered by the seed capital due to the related returns, the utilities will hence be able to reinvest the funds in other projects. Over time it is expected that approximately USD 2.35 million of investment can be leveraged by replicating the pilots in the remaining public buildings. Additionally, there is the potential for other project investments, e.g., in commercial buildings. The CEO Request document has been amended under Output 3.3.

6. Since the public sector (ministries and public budget) cannot provide financing directly due to limitations on public spending and restrictions on committing to additional loans, the project will design a suitable IUS financial mechanism under Output 3.3 that will facilitate the required investment under the IUS model by the utilities. The utilities (which are privatized) confirmed during project development that they are able to take up loans (text on this was added to output 3.2). The exact mechanism and structure (loan structure for utilities and mechanism (direct funding, guarantees, other types of blended finance)) will be determined during project development under 3.3 in cooperation with the utilities, the government and the regulators as well as the financial institutions.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/15/2023: There is no further elaboration, but it is OK because the project design is unchanged. The project is aligned with Objective 1 of the GEF-7 Climate Change Focal Area through the entry points CCM-1-1 and CCM-1-3. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Regarding the sustainability component of the project, please clarify if the project will incorporate measures for the environmentally sound management of replaced units and appliances. If so, please briefly elaborate in this section and/or the alternative scenario. This includes the electricity generation assets and potential appliances that may be replaced.
2. Regarding the potential for scaling up, as commented earlier, considering that one of the main barriers relates to financing, please explain how the revised National Energy Policy will be able to attract and secure the necessary investments. Also,

please elaborate on how much is expected to be leveraged with a \$100,000 seed capital contribution in Output 3.3.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. The draft revised NEP will cover definitions of environmentally sound management measures of replaced units and appliances resulting from accelerated replacements as well as end-of-life management of renewable energy facilities (Output 1.1.). In addition, measures for an environmentally sound management of replaced units and appliances, e.g., ACs, refrigerators and light bulbs etc., will be included in the draft Federal Energy Efficiency Act und Output 1.4. Also under the pilot the EIA will take the aspect into account. The CEO Endorsement document has been updated accordingly (deliverable 1.1.5, deliverable 1.4.1).

2. See answer to question 3 above.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, this section is satisfactory and consistent with the PIF, as approved.

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

N/A

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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the stakeholder section is consistent with the design phase and presents a well-elaborated stakeholder engagement plan. Please address a minor comment:

1. An image didn't upload properly under the "Main conclusion of the stakeholder consultation for the project" sub-section and now is overlapping with the text. Please correct.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Done.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the gender analysis is well elaborated.

Agency Response

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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Please clarify if the private sector and/or potential private sector investors at the local, regional and international level will be engaged in developing the revised National Energy Policy (NEP) and its roadmap.
2. The last paragraph of the Private sector engagement sub-section appears twice. Please correct.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Done, clarified in the private sector engagement section of the CEO document.
2. Corrected.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the gender analysis is well elaborated and includes risks and opportunities related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the institutional arrangements are fully described and possible coordination with other projects is provided.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes, the project is aligned with national strategies and priorities.

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

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Noted. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Please provide the envisaged timeframe for the outputs and deliverables described in Table 23.
2. In addition, the Project?s Results Framework needs to address Knowledge Management and Communication/Dissemination

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. The envisaged timeframe has been added to Table 23, with reference to the workplan in Annex K.

2. The project?s results framework measures the achievement of outcomes, i.e. changes in behaviour. Knowledge management and communication/dissemination are means to achieve such. UNEP and the project management team will track the execution and delivery of these elements through lower level indicators captured in the project workplan, at the output level (output 1.5 on knowledge management), and deliverables 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.5.2, 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 on communication/dissemination. As annex A focuses on outcomes (behavioural

change) it has not been adjusted. This is a common practice applied across UNEP GEF mitigation projects.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes. Cleared.

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Is divided in two comments:
 1. Cleared
 2. Cleared

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Regarding Annex B, please include your response to comments made by GEF Council Members from Germany and Canada.
2. Regarding the Project Budget Table in Annex E:
 1. Office equipment and Project Operation Unit's operating costs should be charged to PMC but not to project components. Please correct.
 2. Please include the column of 'Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency).'

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Done, annex B completed.

2.1. Done. Office equipment was charged to PMC (BL 110503). On budget line 110602 'Operating cost of financial window,' note that this is not related to GEF project management costs. It refers to the banks costs for operationalizing and initial operations of the financial mechanism created by the project and hosted by one of St. Kitts and Nevis financial institutions. Through the financial entity, competitive debt instruments will be made available to the utilities for covering the CAPEX of the demand-side measures in public and private buildings.

- 2.2. Done.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/3/2023:

1. Noted. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. Cleared.
4. Noted. Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. The Results Framework target for Core Indicator 6 should be consistent with the Core Indicator's table expected results value. Please revise it accordingly.
2. Regarding Annex A, we encourage you to revise Indicators 1.1 and 1.2, so they align with our previous comment on Outputs 1.1 and 1.4 (i.e. development and adoption of the revised NEP and Federal Energy Efficiency Act).
3. We encourage you to review Indicator 3 to increase its ambition or be more specific.
4. The Project Results Framework should include targeted knowledge management and communications/dissemination metrics. Please review and amend.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

1. Annex A refers to end of project targets, i.e. at the end of the four years of the project's execution, as these indicators will be measured at the end of project (and through-out its execution) and assessed by the mid-term and terminal evaluations. Annex F refers to lifetime project direct and indirect emission reductions achieved over the lifetime of the investments (in this case 20 years as per annex L). This has been clarified in annex A.

2. Refer to response to question 3 above.

3. Done.

4. Refer to response above on the knowledge management section. Metrics exist as outputs and deliverables, lower level indicators that will be tracked throughout project execution through the workplan.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 3/15/2023: Yes

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/3/2023: Cleared.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please include your responses to comments made by GEF Council Members from Germany and Canada, as appropriate.

Agency Response

Response 30/03/2023

Done, annex B updated.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 3/15/2023: Yes

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/3/2023: Annex C has been updated and a comment by the PM has been included related to a typo.

EBF 3/15/2023: According to Annex C, we note that \$34,871 have been spent to date out of the \$60,000 requested for PPG. There is an unspent balance of \$25,129.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 3/15/2023: Yes.

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/5/2023: The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Endorsement.

EBF 4/3/2023: Please address the comment **highlighted in yellow** above.

EBF 3/15/2023: Please address the comments above.

**** Please **highlight in green** the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. ****

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/15/2023	3/29/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/3/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations