



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9232		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Mekong Countries		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,907,064
Co-financing:	\$10,360,447	Total Project Cost:	\$13,367,511
PIF Approval:	March 14, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Paul Hartman	Agency Contact Person:	Scott Perkin

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>The project is identified to align with BD4-9, CCM2-4, LD3-4, SFM 3 and 4. Please identify the relevant BD Aichi target that the project will be contributing to.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 The linkage with specific Aichi Targets have been clarified. On the SFM objective, the project is in line with SFM3, but not SFM4. Please</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		delete SFM 4, and delete or move the identified amount to SFM3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Not sufficient. Please provide clear information on how this project align with the national strategies related to CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD. Please identify relevant objective/section of these documents related to the project initiative in each country. The information currently provided is insufficient to recognise the linkages.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Adequate information provided at this stage.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Drivers: No. Insufficient information on the drivers and threats to peatlands in the concerned countries. Please provide additional information.</p> <p>Sustainability: No. Unclear. The PIF, at one point, informs that further assessment and development of national strategy/action plan is required to conserve and sustainably use the peatlands. But the activities in Cambodia and Laos are rather focused on site based management (with very limited STAR finance). To ensure sustainability of the activities, the project design needs to</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>be reviewed and revised, and focused on priority and cost-effective actions.</p> <p>Scaling and Innovation: No. It is unclear how issues of upscaling will be addressed through such limited investment in each country. It is also unclear how sustainable income generation methods and alternative agriculture practice could be innovative, and whether these measures actually respond to the key drivers and threats.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Additional information provided but not sufficient. On the sustainability issue, please clearly indicate in the project framework and other relevant section that the national plans that will be developed will incorporate concrete measures on institutional and financial structures and approaches.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>1) Besides the development of the regional strategy and its endorsement by the ASEAN ministers, it is unclear what the baseline activities are in each of the participating countries. The PIF only notes "excellent results" from the former EU project without any specificity. Please clarify the results and identified gaps in each of</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the country.</p> <p>2) It is also unclear what the EU grant contribution will be doing, and what the GEF will be financing to compliment. The coordination mechanism for implementation is also unclear. Please clarify.</p> <p>3) Cofinancing ratio is less than 1 to 2. This is not adequate. Please increase cofinancing to at least 1 to 3 or more, following recent cofinancing ratio of other GEF projects in the participating countries.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015            Additional information provided but not sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We understand that there are actually many projects and programs underway that are assessing and surveying peatlands in these countries. Baseline and incremental reasoning of these activities is not clear. Please further clarify what has already been done and what are being planned, and what the GEF project will be doing on these issues.</li> <li>- While information on the four sites are helpful, please provide information on the baseline and incremental reasoning for GEF investment. If surveys and</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>assessments are already underway with other investments, consider shifting finance of component 1/2 towards component 3.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Without clear information on the baseline and cofinancing initiatives, it is hard to examine whether the suggested project framework is appropriate or not. Please provide the necessary information noted under section 4.</p> <p>On the GEBs, please provide specific and tangible information on the global biodiversity benefits, including species and ecosystem services, not a very general and vague statement as currently provided. Please also provide specific information on the sustainable land management benefits.</p> <p>To ensure consolidated and collaborative approach among the participating countries, it would make more sense to have the components based on issues, not by countries. For example, this would mean components such as: 1) assessments and mapping; 2) national strategy and institutional framework development; and 3) demonstrate best practices in selected priority sites. It could potentially enable more meaningful</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and effective technical assistance and knowledge exchange on related activities among the countries, rather than just putting three small country-level projects in one umbrella.</p> <p>As noted above, it would be important to review the scope of the project and examine if small demonstration activities are the most needed and cost effective investment at this point, when the countries have not completed basic assessment and strategy development. Further baseline analysis (including drivers and threats), are required to build a more convincing and comprehensive project design.</p> <p>Component 4 on regional collaboration, as it stands, is very vague and do not provide any value added. Please review and consider appropriate strategy and actions.</p> <p>The PIF requires substantial revision in project design and other elements.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Substantial revision has been made on the project design, however, requires further clarification/revision on below: 1) institutional and financial</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainability issues to be incorporated as commented above.</p> <p>2) GEB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please clarify extent of protected areas coverage and non-PA coverage (i.e. landscape) for peatland conservation and sustainable use.</li> <li>- The CO2 reduction estimate seems rather high for the coverage. Please clarify the method being used.</li> </ul> <p>3) Coordination: Please further clarify on how this regional project will be managed in relation to the other GEF-6 peatland projects in Indonesia and Malaysia.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>Gender - considering strong relevance, please clarify and ensure gender analysis will be included as part of the socio-economic assessment at the PPG stage, and gender responsive results framework will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement. Please also provide appropriate information based on country situation rather than cut and pasting same information for all related projects.</p> <p>IPs - Please clarify that the appropriate IPs Plan will developed through a FPIC process.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Additional information provided.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Please clearly state that the IP plan will be developed based on the FPIC process.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Cambodia: LD resource is within the GEF-6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is 1 to 2.</p> <p>Laos: LD and CC resources are within the GEF-6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is a little less than 1 to 2.</p> <p>Myanmar: BD and CC resources are within the GEF 6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is 1 to 2.</p> <p>PPG: The PPG amount is much higher than the norm. Please reduce to 100k for projects below \$3m.</p> <p>Agency fee: It is slightly higher than 9%. Please revise.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PPG amount needs to be based on GEF Grant amount (excluding Agency Fee). Please revise it to 100k.</li> <li>- The Agency Fee is still higher than 9%. Please reduce it to \$257135 (9% of the GEF Grant amount).</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Refer above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>No, please review the comments carefully and review the scope of the project. The PIF requires substantial revision.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 No. Substantial revision has been made but some elements have not been addressed fully. Please refer to the above comments and resubmit.</p> <p>7 Dec 2015 The PIF has been revised accordingly, and ready to be technically cleared. However, the PM has recognized that the GEB targets under the Table F and the text (page 13) are not consistent both on BD coverage and CCM GHG targets. Please kindly review the numbers again, and revise the table F accordingly. Further, the GHG emission target should be under item 4 on CCM, not item 5 on Chemicals under the table F. Please resubmit the revised PIF.</p> <p>8 Jan 2016 Yes. The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM technically clears the PIF for work</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		program inclusion.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 18, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 07, 2015	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	10/26/17 Reference to palm oil has been removed as it is not considered a main threat to peatlands in the three target countries. No other significant changes from the PIF. Cleared.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	10/26/17 No.  The project is highly ambitious and the structure of the program is very broad, covering three countries, and including efforts to survey and	02/09/18 Some significant re-adjustment and streamlining has been undertaken to improve the feasibility of implementation. The project builds on earlier work supported through IFAD GEF and EU and ASEAN to establish national and regional frameworks for peatlands

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>validate peat areas; create new protected areas and contribute to national/sub-national level conservation planning; undertake site level interventions; and share lessons regionally.</p> <p>1) Considering the complexities of working on the range of initiatives detailed in the ProDoc concurrently in three separate countries, it is unclear how objectives can be optimally achieved with the level of grant financing requested and co-financing secured. Please consider reducing the ambition of the project to better align with the timeline and resources available. It would seem that output 2.3 is highly important given the context of peatlands in the three countries, whereas some of the direct site interventions, while useful, may be premature given lack of knowledge on the importance of peatlands in the areas.</p> <p>2) Component one on expansion of the network of protected peatlands in target countries does not seem likely to be achieved through the activities identified. Presenting survey results, plans, and recommendations at a single national workshop in each country is an important step in a</p>	<p>management – evidence that a combined, national, regional and local approach is feasible.</p> <p>1) The results framework and intervention strategy have been reworked and the budget adjusted accordingly. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The ambition of Output 1.2 has been reduced.</li> <li>- Output 2.1 has been streamlined.</li> <li>- Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 have been merged, while emphasizing the importance of national policies and plans.</li> </ul> <p>Due to their importance for the commitment of national stakeholders in the three countries and their importance in terms of peatland area/size, we have not reduced the site interventions. These interventions will benefit from significant co-financing from other projects, such as Mekong WET (IUCN) and IFAD. Removal of site-based components will likely reduce government support and significantly reduce co-funding.</p> <p>2) Component 1 has been modified accordingly and now primarily focuses on peatland assessment and documentation, which is essential to support capacity development and policy making.</p> <p>BD-1 program 2 has been removed and the budget shifted to BD-1 program 1.</p> <p>3) BD TT adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>4) Results framework has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>5) Further detail on Beung Kiat Ngong has been added in section 3.1 Background and</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>process of creating protected areas, but without significant follow up is highly unlikely to result in their creation alone. We recommend that project component one be modified and that in the CEO Endorsement Table A, BD-1 program 2 be removed as a project FA objective.</p> <p>3) In table A of the CEO Endorsement for objective BD-1 program 1, please ensure that progress in achieving focal area outcome 1.2 is measured through a change in the PA management effectiveness score (using the METT Assessment Form in the BD TT) for each of the PAs where activities contributing to this objective will be undertaken.</p> <p>4) Project outcomes 1 &amp; 2 are very vague. Please make outcomes more specific by including the targeted results that will be achieved through use of the project financing dedicated to them. Use outcome 3 as a model.</p> <p>5) Please provide further detail on the values and global significance of the Beung Kiat Ngong area in Laos, including the basis for its recognition as a Ramsar site and HCV area. Please also explain the likelihood that</p>	<p>Context.</p> <p>Added explanation in section 5. Intervention strategy, under Output 3.2. The values and functions of the Bung Naphat sites will be investigated in more detail under the survey and assessment tasks associated with Outputs 1.1-1.2. If necessary, the selection of the target villages will be adjusted following these assessments. Their connection with the Beung Kiat Ngong landscape has also been emphasized. The interventions with combined GEF and co-funding will cover the whole Beung Kiat Ngong landscape and so global benefits will be derived from the whole landscape. Forested peatlands are some of the rarest ecosystems in the Mekong region with significant potential for localised endemics – so it is considered very important that these systems in Lao PDR are retained in the project.</p> <p>6) Section 3.1 has been revised accordingly. Some general information has been moved to new Appendix 10.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the site/village areas selected for intervention under the project -- that are currently outside the Ramsar site - - contain similar values. Considering how little is known about this area and its values, we question whether the site is worthy of investment or that work undertaken here will generate Global Environmental Benefits.</p> <p>6) In the section on Background and Context (3.1) please pare down the amount of general ecological information on peat and provide more specifics on the biodiversity, CC and LD values of the target countries, landscapes, and sites, and the context under which these exist. For example, no information on the specific biodiversity values of the three target areas is presented until the tables found in section four. As the project should be targeting GEBs, a stronger case should be made up front on the global importance of the area for their BD, CC, and LD GEBs and the threats currently faced/opportunities available.</p> <p>03/02/18 The project has been streamlined and the design is appropriate to achieve desired results according to timeline</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and budget. This is reflected in the adjusted project outcomes in the results framework, focal area outcomes, and a revised budget breakdown. Increased focus has been placed on assessment, capacity building and impacting policy at both the national and subnational levels in order to gain formal recognition of the importance of peat lands as land classification in need of special management, which is currently a critical gap in the three countries. Better justification has been provided of the BD and CCM importance Beung Kiat Ngong and Bung Naphat. An improved explanation has been provided of the appropriateness of the proposed interventions and the role that co-financing will play in the larger landscape.</p> <p>TT have been revised and are now clearer. Cleared</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>10/26/17 No. See point 1 in question 2 above. Additionally:</p> <p>1) Please review Table B of the CEO Endorsement and ensure that the amounts indicated in the GEF Project Financing columns are recalculated so that they add up correctly in the</p>	<p>02/09/18 1) Done. 2) The amounts indicated in Table D are correct and in line with the PIF amounts. While these amounts do not exactly match those detailed in the OFP endorsement letters of the three countries (due to several earlier revisions), the total amounts committed by the countries (450,000 for Cambodia, 577,700 for</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>subtotal line. Once completed, also ensure that the totals below this are adjusted as necessary.</p> <p>2) The Trust Fund resources requested by focal area for Myanmar in Table D of the CEO Endorsement do not match those in the detailed in OFP endorsement letter. In Table D, please align Myanmar amounts and the trust fund resources for each country with the amounts in the OFP endorsement letter or obtain new OFP endorsement letters.</p> <p>03/02/18 In Table B, please adjust the PMC for the co-financing amount so it doesn't exceed 5%.</p> <p>03/13/18 Financing is adequate and the project demonstrates a cost-effective approach to meet project objectives. Cleared</p>	<p>Lao PDR, and 2,250,000 for Myanmar) are exactly the same as the total amounts indicated in Table D plus 109,000 for the approved PPG (Table E in PIF).</p> <p>03/07/18 PMC for co-financing has been adjusted.</p>
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>10/26/17 Yes, major risks including climate change are identified. Cleared</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>10/26/17 Cofinancing is confirmed, however:</p>	<p>02/09/18 1) Done.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>1) In Table C the amount of combined co-financing confirmed for IFAD is \$2.25m while the amount of co-financing detailed in IFAD's confirmation letter is \$2.5m. Please correct.</p> <p>2) The amount confirmed in the GIZ confirmation letter is 3m Euros while in Table C this falls under "European Union" with an amount of 3m USD. Please convert the confirmed financing from Euros to USD equivalent and correct this and the Co-financier name in Table C.</p> <p>03/02/18 Co-financing is confirmed and evidence is provided. Cleared</p>	<p>2) Done. Converted to USD 3.5 million based on a conservative exchange rate.</p>
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>10/26/17 No.</p> <p>1) For the GHG benefits calculation in the prodoc calculations in Table 7 total 894,300 tons avoided CO2-eq for 4 years, but in the EX-ACT file it totals 163 million tons CO2-eq, and in the CEO endorsement request the amount in Table F totals 4,471,500 million tons. Please choose a single methodology you will use to present the carbon calculations and present a total benefit amount consistently</p>	<p>02/09/18 1) Section 5. Intervention strategy, relevant TTs and CEO Endorsement Request have been adjusted and are now consistent. We are proposing to focus only on the 4-year project period, rather than on direct/indirect emissions over a 20 year period, to be more conservative. (IUCN had been in touch with FAO to discuss some issues in the FAO Ex-ACT tool and its application to peatlands. After revision, the numbers in the Ex-ACT tool still seemed very high and IUCN and GEC are proposing a revised calculation that is more conservative and easier to understand, included in Section 5.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>throughout the CEO Endorsement, Prodoc and GHG TT. We recommend that you choose the EX-ACT tool for estimation of carbon emission reductions and that you provide a 1-2 pager description of the activities implemented for the region that lead to that total. Currently it's not easy to review the estimates without such a description.</p> <p>2)The target amount in Table F of the CEO Endorsement for LD/SLM (Corporate Result 2) doesn't match what is in the LD TT. There appear to be two LD TT which makes it confusing to understand what the total is, but neither one or the combined amount match the amount in Table F.</p> <p>3) It is unclear why only the hectares of improved land management from the Myanmar site are included in the BD TT, and not from the other two sites. Please clarify or adjust accordingly.</p> <p>4) The SFM TT file wouldn't open. Please resubmit another version.</p> <p>03/02/18 The GHG calculations presented are missing the results of the 'without project' scenario. What would the</p>	<p>Intervention strategy.)</p> <p>2) Numbers have been adjusted and are now consistent with the LD TT.</p> <p>3) We have now included all three countries/sites, to make the numbers consistent across TTs.</p> <p>4) Reformatted.</p> <p>03/07/18 Clarification has been added in Section 5 Intervention Strategy (p. 2). "Without the project interventions, 874,980 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e would be released into the atmosphere in the business-as-usual scenario from the areas described below." This is an estimate based on the assumptions described in Section 5 with regards to the project interventions. As noted, the exact extent and carbon storage of the peatlands in the pilot areas is unknown and it is therefore difficult to assess all carbon emissions from peatland degradation and loss in the target countries with and without the project. The assessment of the carbon storage will, however, be part of Output 1.2. The calculations are conservative, thus they are unlikely to be overestimates.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>emissions be generated if the project is not implemented? There seems to be enough data that could be inserted under Tier 2 level in order to attain more accurate results and avoid overestimations. Please make sure to include the missing results or use the EXACT tool in order to improve the description of your assessment.</p> <p>03/13/18                      Relevant tracking tools are complete. A projection of CO<sub>2</sub>eq emitted without project intervention has been provided. During implementation the Agency should perhaps revisit and revise the GHG Emissions TT based on the carbon storage assessment that is to be undertaken as part of the project. Policy changes that the project seeks to implement may also have an indirect impact on GHG emissions, which can be assessed following the completion of these successful policy interventions.                      Cleared</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>10/26/17                      We are pleased to see numerous national and regional initiatives identified, including GEF projects. Please provide further details on the</p>	<p>02/09/18                      Details added in ProDoc, section 3.5.2. GEF Interventions. The project will ensure coordination with ongoing initiatives through its Executing Partners and the Project Steering</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>mechanism through which the project will coordinate with these initiatives.</p> <p>03/02/18 The Prodoc demonstrates that the project is coordinated with other initiatives and national/regional plans in the three target countries. Cleared</p>	<p>Committee. The regular meetings under ASEAN (i.e., ASEAN Task Force on Peatlands, but also its working groups on biodiversity and climate change) will provide a platform for collaboration with other GEF projects in the region and in the target countries. Furthermore, IUCN and GEC are involved in several of these projects and will ensure cooperation and coordination with these. The Terms of Reference of the National Project Directors and the Chief Technical Advisor include reference to coordination with other interventions and to exploring opportunities for collaboration with other regional and national projects.</p>
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>10/26/17 Budget for M&amp;E plan is specified and a detailed monitoring plan is provided. Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>10/26/17 Yes, descriptions of the KM plan have been provided. Cleared.</p>	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, the agency has responded adequately to STAP comments. Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	N/A	

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>10/26/17 No, please address identified issues and questions.</p> <p>03/13/18 Yes, issues and comments have been adequately addressed and the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	October 26, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 02, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 13, 2018	