

Blue Horizon: Ocean Relief through Seaweed Aquaculture

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10573

Countries

Regional

Project Name

Blue Horizon: Ocean Relief through Seaweed Aquaculture

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

2/28/2022

Review completed by PM

6/2/2022

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

Focal Area

International Waters

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
SH (4.5.22): Yes, the project remains fully aligned. 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 SH (4.5.22): Yes, the project structure works across both the local, national, regional and global scales to deliver on a set of highly innovative outcomes and outputs specific to advancing the seaweed sector in Vietnam/Philippines and regionally scale. 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

SH (4.5.22): The cofinance has been significantly reduced between PIF and CEO endorsement stage. One would have expected the PPG stage to advance discussions with cofinanciers. Please explain a) the reasoning behind the significant reduction and b) how the project intends to deliver on outcomes/outputs under the reduced co-finance scenario? GEF notes that the project expects significant additional private sector cofinance to materialize during implementation.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

Thank you for your comment. This shortfall is largely owed to the constraints brought about by the pandemic. While the project has advanced discussions with some cofinanciers and private sector partners (e.g. Brabender, Tri Tin), additional co-financing will be sought during project implementation with private sector partners. The project strategy (outcome 3.3.) has specific outputs dedicated to this purpose, and is expected to mobilize an additional \$15 million in co-financing from the private sector.

The Blue Horizon Project outputs and activities are not jeopardized by the shortfall. Firstly, the project is compact and adopts the strategy of delivering the essential outputs. The design is such that different outputs (such as those at national level) contribute to each other and to the outputs at the regional level. The project strategy also aims at encouraging synergy among the participating entities in the implementation of the various activities. In the implementation of the pilot seaweed farm, the strategy in the Philippines is to engage the partnership (which also provides co-financing) of a social enterprise, Coast4C, which has a long and vast experience in mobilizing farming communities and developing and implementing initiatives on sustainable seaweed farming and trading in several areas in the Philippines. In Viet Nam, the Project will engage the partnership of private companies and the active participation of communes. In the post-harvest aspect, partnership with Brabender in the Philippines, engagement of BFAR's national seaweeds technology development center, the departments of science

and technology and department of labor's Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, and an expected engagement with one or more local processors in Vietnam will ensure delivery of the outputs on biorefinery solutions and value-added consumer items production. The delivery of regional level outputs and the implementation of the activities to produce them shall be marked by cost-effectiveness by the direct participation of three organic units of SEAFDEC (Secretariat, Aquaculture Department based in the Philippines and Training Department based in Thailand) and the harnessing of the regional network of experts in the various fishery departments of its member governments. In sum, the confirmed resources shall enable the highly effective implementation of the activities and satisfactory delivery of the outputs of the Project.

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 SH (4.5.22): Yes, 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 SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

SH (4.5.22): There are changes to the CIs which have been reduced based on PPG findings. CIs remains realistic.

Please;

1. include under indicator 5.2 the Sulu Selebs Sea LME

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

2. populate CI 7.1 and 7.2

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

3. Include sulu-Celebes Sea in indicator 7.3

SH (5.11.22): Please consider re-adjusting indicator 7.3 to reflect the current level of national/local reforms.

SH (5.12.22): Thank you, cleared.

4. Readjust indicator 7.4 from 4 to 1.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 12th 2022:

3. Thank you for your comment, indicator 7.3 has been adjusted to a '1'

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

Thank you for your comments.

1. Sulu Celebes Sea LME has been included under 5.2

2. Core Indicator 7.1 has been populated. The project will coordinate with the Regional Management Institutions responsible for implementation of the SAP's/SDS SEA (COBSEA, Tri National Committee, PEMSEA), but will not directly advance or contribute to Core Indicator 7.2.

3. The project will not directly contribute to national/local reforms in Philippines/Sulu Celebes Sea. The project will only advance national/local reforms in VN and South China Sea. For this reason, the project is not adding the Sulu Celebes Sea LME to 7.3.

4. The indicator has been adjusted from 4 to 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

SH (4.5.22):

In Portal CEO endorsement submission section specific to 'The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?' section; please expand this section so that it is clear what problems, root causes and barriers the project will work to overcome. It will be important to also include info specific to root causes and barriers for sust. production and processing of seaweeds.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

The section in the Portal has been expanded so that it is clear what problems, root causes, and barriers the project will work to overcome. Specific barriers have been included on sustainable production (see barriers related to marine spatial plans, operational barriers, and value chain barriers) and processing of seaweeds (see barrier related to biorefinery solutions and value chains).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Yes, 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

SH (4.5.22):

Components are clearly described, however, please address the below comments;

1. Portal CEO endorsement submission section specific to 'The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project?'; please in this section reflect on the business-as-usual scenario, e.g. what happens if none of the identified barriers and drivers are addressed. Also, please expand the Theory of Change figure to include barriers/drivers and how the project will overcome these.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

2. Please insure that a interministerial committee or a Multi-sector Expert Working Group is also established to guide cross sector coordination specific to planned activities in Philippines.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

3. Please explain how the project will document the perceived environmental benefits specific to seaweed production - (i.e. coral reefs, marine life that constitute the various trophic levels) and services (such as provision of breeding places and shelter to marine life), and maintained capacity of natural systems to sequester carbon? Please consider if a specific project output can be added that targets the documentation of environmental benefits and/or negative impacts (entanglement of marine life in cultivation lines etc.). Such data over time may enable science informed decision making specific to the potential expansion of in-shore/off-shore seaweed production sites, including into Marine Protected Areas. This activity should be linked to the planned monitoring system.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

1. The Theory of Change figure in the Portal CEO submission now includes barriers, drivers, and shows how the project strategy will address these. The narrative has also been expanded to show how the business-as-usual scenario will be changed through the project. A Theory of Change diagram showing more causal links is also included in the ProDoc, Section 2.1.

2. A National Coordinating Committee will be constituted in the Philippines to provide the strategic direction to the project and ensure that its implementation achieves outcomes that are beneficial to all relevant economic sectors and the benefits are equitably shared by the primary stakeholders. The functions and membership are provided in Technical Appendix 5.2. In addition, two local coordinating committees (for the Palawan and Zamboanga project sites) will be formed to carry out joint local stakeholders planning in line with Project objectives and strategies, promote local stakeholders? understanding of the Project objectives, strategies and outputs, and ensure local stakeholders? active and equitable representation in the Project plans and activities.

Members will be local government officers, environmental officers and farmer association/cooperative leaders knowledgeable on the seaweed industry.

A description of these committees can now be found in the ProDoc (Section 2.3), the Appendices (Appendix 5.2), and the Portal CEO endorsement submission (Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination).

3. Thank you for your comment. The project will document environmental benefits specific to seaweed production. Environmental and social benefits and services will be monitored throughout the life of the project. In the Philippines, this will be monitored through the MSP implementation (see Output 2.1.1), which integrates sustainable seaweed practices, 'replenishment' zones and sustainable fishing zones so that seaweed acts as an enabler and incentive for more effective marine protection allowing habitat restoration, and as part of the ongoing seaweed farm monitoring (Output 3.1.1). Four additional monitoring activities have been added to Output 2.1.1 to track fisheries catch, nutrient levels, monitoring of entanglements, and monitoring of marine plastics. In Viet Nam, environmental benefits will be monitored and reported on through the Information Management System being developed (Output 2.2.2) - which will monitor nutrient absorption, enhancement of habitat of marine life/increase in fish catch in seaweed farming areas), and any impacts on corals and on red-listed species of seaweed farms - and at the seaweed farm level (Output 3.1.1). Viet Nam will monitor and assess the environmental impacts of the pond-based *Caulerpa* farming by comparing the level of N and P in the effluent discharges from shrimp farming sites and from *Caulerpa* farming sites; and comparing the overall quality (dissolved oxygen content, heavy metals, etc) of pond waters in shrimp and *Caulerpa* ponds. Overall, the results will be documented and shared through the project's communication strategy (Output 4.1.2). Text has been added to the Portal submission and ProDoc, elaborating this monitoring and communication approach

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Yes, 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

SH (4.5.22): Yes. This section also contains a description of changes to Core Indicators since council approval stage. 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

SH (4.5.22): Yes. This is a well framed project with a high degree of innovation and potential for scaling up with innovations specific to both offshore commercial-scale farming that will enable better climate resilience and less conflict with other users. The mainstreaming of standards across environment, consumer and operational safety and links to regional/global markets is also innovative and may enable a long term and environmentally sound growth framework for the sector. Finally, the project will perform biorefinery pilots and anchor value at the national/local community level which is both innovative and equitable. 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

SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

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
SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
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
SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

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
SH (4.5.22): Yes, 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

SH (4.5.22): Yes, risks have been elaborately described. 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

SH (4.5.22): Yes, 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

SH (4.5.22):

Portal CEO endorsement submission section specific to the 'baseline scenario and any associated baseline programs?; please provide more detail on what priorities specific to the South China Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Plan and the Sulu Celebes Large Marine Ecosystem the project is targeting.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

Noted. More detail has been provided in the baseline on the specific priorities the project will support related to the South China Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Plan and the Sulu Celebes Large Marine Ecosystem (see Portal CEO endorsement submission section 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline programs; see ProDoc Section 1.5).

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

SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

SH (4.5.22): 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

SH (4.5.22): 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

SH (4.5.22): Please provide more info specific to the perceived benefits when introducing biorefinery solutions and subsequent increased value from the seaweed biomass.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

Thank you for your comment. A description of the social and environmental benefits of the biorefinery solutions has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request (Section 3: The proposed alternative scenario) and ProDoc (Section 2.2), under Output 3.1.2 Implementation of at least 2 seaweed value chain initiatives.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Please in the results framework include a sex disaggregated indicator specific to the measuring of project beneficiaries.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

The results framework includes the following sex-dissaggregated indicators:

- Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (row 4 in the results framework table)
- % targeted seaweed farming household report they have increased benefits from the seaweed farm and value addition initiatives - this includes sex disaggregation

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Please see comment specific to cofinance. In addition, please address the below two comments.

Please ensure that all ToRs are provided, including for the overall Project Manager and other key project staff in the regional PMU.

SH (5.11.22): Specific to the ToR for the Project Manager/Technical Advisor, please indicate clearly which activities are PMC related and which relates to TA being charged under the different project components.

SH (5.12.22): Thank you, cleared.

While changes between PIF council approval stage and CEO End submission stage to CIs and table B are justified, it would be beneficial to have an overview of all such changes. Please include a table in the PRODOC, which shows changes specific project objectives/outputs/CI between PIF and CEO Endorsement stage.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

17th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following comments

(1) Co-financing. Regarding the WWF-US \$3,584,825 grant. As per the co-financing letter, the original source of this grant is Bezos Earth Fund (to WWF-US). Therefore, please change the Table C line to: Private Sector | Bezos Earth Fund | Grant | Investment Mobilized | \$3,584,825.

Obtaining a co-financing letter from Bezos Earth Fund is preferable, but not necessary.

(2) Annex E Budget Table. The Project Manager / Technical Advisor is being charged to project components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$443K and co-financing for \$4.3 million represented in grants. Some portion of this could be used to cover the costs of the project's staff. Please revise accordingly.

(3) Gender. The project elaborates on the gender dimensions to be considered but only in the section on Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment. Considering that the project specifies that the majority of seaweed farmers where the project will be implemented are women, the project should be more explicit in indicating the specific gender dimension of the project in the description of each project component. For example, with regard to the beneficiaries of training and capacity building interventions, reflection of gender perspectives and gender expertise in knowledge products produced, or in planning and assessments undertaken. Monitoring and evaluation should also reflect gender perspectives.

31st of May 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) The Terms of Reference for the Project Manager/Technical Advisor includes duties and responsibilities that are technical in nature, and which justify charging a portion of this position to the technical components.

(3) Addressed. Additional information on gender dimensions has been added to the description of each project component, including M&E, in the proposed alternative scenario section.

7th of June 2022 (thenshaw): while comment 1 and 3 were addressed, comment 2 was not. The explanation provided by the Agency in the Review Sheet for not using the co-financing resources to cover the project staff is that these resources "were not available" "already committed" "dedicated to other uses". If that is the case, these resources are not meeting the intended use stated in Guidelines, which are to cover the costs associated with the project's execution. As a result, the Agency explains that "PM/TA is charged to Components 1 and Component 4 for technical delivery, and to the PMC for project management functions." (\$153,373 / 87% charged to the Project's components and \$21,627 / 13% charged to PMC). However, when assessing the TOR's, the distribution of technical vs. managerial tasks don't do justice to the proportion that is charged to the project's components: nearly all the tasks are managerial in nature (as it should be the case of a Project Manager). Based on the above, please use part of the co-financing portion or explore other possibilities (Agency's own-managed trust funds or funds from other co-financiers) to cover the costs associated with the project's execution (project's staff).

6th of July 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency July 7th, 2022:

A significant portion of the project management tasks listed (for this position) is a combination of TA/PM/M&E functions. For instance, tasks #2, #3, #5, #6 and #7 are all closely linked to the technical delivery of Components 1 and 4 (requiring time for project management, but also technical review and delivery). Therefore, the time/budget for those tasks is split across PMC and the technical components. Capacities are in place for financial management, both through SEAFDEC's existing infrastructure and a financial officer who is being recruited to the project, reducing the amount of time needed for the PM to undertake these tasks while still ensuring overall oversight (tasks #9 and #11).

In addition, some project management functions will be supported through SEAFDEC, including administrative tasks, recruitment of project staff, and communication and coordination with SEAFDEC member countries.

Given this, a smaller percentage of time was budgeted under PMC. 12.5% of the time (and budget) is allocated to project management tasks, 41.5% to monitoring and communications, and 46% to Technical Delivery under Component 1.

Altogether we're confident that the necessary project management tasks for this project are covered and funded.

WWF GEF Agency May 26th 2022:

1. Thank you for your comment. The identified BEF co-finance is part of a larger grant from BEF to WWF. We are seeking a co-financing letter directly from Bezos Earth Fund. Given the tight timeline, this letter will be obtained and uploaded at a later date.

Since the project co-finance letter is signed by WWF, it is proposed to keep the Table C line as WWF-US. During project reporting, Bezos Earth Fund will be specified.

Please note that Bezos Earth Fund is not private sector, it is a private foundation.

2. The \$4.3 million in grant co-financing is already committed, and therefore cannot be used to cover a portion of the project staff time.

? The grant co-financing from Safe Seaweed Coalition represents grants to seaweed initiatives selected through their competitive process and not available for the project to use as staffing costs

? The WWF-US grant contribution (3,584,825) is already committed to partners advancing the seaweed industry. These partners were selected prior to the project development process.

? The grant contribution from Tri Tin Company (562,608) is dedicated to cost-sharing the establishment of two pilot model farms (pond and coastal water) of Caulerpa or seagrass and purchase of seaweed products in the project site.

The PM/TA is charged to Components 1 and Component 4 for technical delivery, and to the PMC for project management functions. This approach achieves higher cost-efficiency and reinforces government ownership of the project and buy-in to its outcomes.

3. The ProDoc and CER now includes additional detail on gender dimensions for each component, including knowledge products and capacity building interventions. The

project monitoring and evaluation plan includes surveys with seaweed farmers and stakeholders to gather gender perspectives and assess women and men's empowerment.

WWF GEF Agency May 12th 2022:

Thank you for your comment. The ToR now clearly specifies which activities are PMC related and which are TA. This role combines responsibilities for Project Management and technical delivery (delivery of Component 1 and deliverables related to monitoring and evaluation) to ensure a cost-efficient approach.

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

ToRs for key project staff in the regional PMU are now included in Appendix 5.1.

A table in the ProDoc Appendices (Appendix 8) has been included that summarizes all changes between PIF and CEO Endorsement stage.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22):

Please also address council comments from Germany, Norway/Denmark and the United States. All council comments can be found via this link.

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_C.59_Compilation_Council_Comments.pdf

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency May 9th 2022:

Responses to the Germany, Norway/Denmark, and US Council comments are now included.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): cleared.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): cleared.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): cleared.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (4.5.22): cleared.

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 NA.

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 NA.

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (4.5.22): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (5.11.22): Please address comments and resubmit.

17th of May 2022 (thenshaw) No. Please address comments in GEF Secretariat Comments field above and resubmit. Thank you.

7th of June 2022 (thenshaw). No, Please address above comment and resubmit. Thank you.

6th of July 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations