



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

GEF ID:	9514		
Country/Region:	Central African Republic		
Project Title:	Forest and Landscape Restoration supporting Landscape and Livelihoods Resilience in the Central African Republic (CAR)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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):	LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; SFM-3; SFM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$165,000	Project Grant:	\$5,961,638
Co-financing:	\$10,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,526,638
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Christophe Besacier

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental		

¹ 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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?			
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?			
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?			
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?			
	Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		• The STAR allocation?		
• The focal area allocation?				
• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access				
• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?				
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 1, 2016 UA:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.</p>		
	Review Date	Review		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	29 January 2018 The project components are consistent with the initial concept of the PFD, as well as the amount requested from each Focal Area.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	29 January 2018 The project design follows the TRI framework and its four components on 1) policy development, 2) implementation of restoration initiatives, 3) Institutions, Finance, and up-scaling, and 4) Knowledge, Partnerships, Monitoring, and Assessment. Nevertheless, the following comments need to be addressed:	February 2018 1-The CER template has been amended as suggested. 2-On page 27 of the CER template, an introductory paragraph was added, explaining the link between CAR project outputs and the PFD outcome 3 targets. 3- The field sites to be targeted by the project within the selected intervention areas will be selected in a participatory manner based on the

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>1- the project description in the CEO Endorsement Request is confusing as it refers to sections that are not present in the document. For instance, where are the Part 2.1.3 supra and the Part 2.3 infra mentioned in page 5? Instead of copying entire parts of the FAO Project Document (including long list of species), it would be much clearer to focus on the necessary information which is useful for the GEF CEO Endorsement Request format.</p> <p>2- It is unclear how the outputs of component 3 will allow to achieve the expected outcomes. While the proposal relies mainly on capacity building, studies and coordination, the PFD seeks for concrete improvements cross-sectoral mechanisms, field-level support mechanisms established/strengthened, value of resources flowing into restoration initiatives and developed bankable restoration projects. Please adjust this component and explain in the project description how the proposed outputs will allow to obtain the expected outcomes.</p> <p>3- The project sites with action on the ground need to be precised with the geographical coordinates, so that</p>	<p>results of ROAM (under Output 1.1.2). Therefore, the PMU will engage itself to communicate geographical coordinates of field sites in a timely manner (through annual reports and mid-term/terminal evaluations) when these become available.</p> <p>Additionally, on page 21 of the CER template, the larger areas of intervention have been identified more clearly.</p> <p>4.a-The reason why the target will be identified at a later stage has been clarified in table B of the CER template.</p> <p>4.b-Requested information was added in table B and the annex 1 of the CER template.</p> <p>4.c-Carbon benefits have been added explicitly under component 2, but had been reported at the objective level already.</p> <p>4.d-Please, note that the target 3.1.1 (1 National Coordination mechanism on FLR) does indeed correspond to indicator 3.1 (Number of cross-agency mechanisms and/or frameworks established and maintained to strengthen and facilitate coordinated national and sub-national action on restoration). The indicator is coherent with the M&E framework of the PFD and with the harmonized tracking tools for TRI, though the language of the indicator has been slightly adapted to the context of the CAR. The intended National</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>future GEF IEO impact evaluations have geographical reference data. We understand that the data may be difficult to provide at this stage as the restoration sites will be selected after the application of the ROAM tools. Please, in the project documents, provide a map with the targeted zones as precise as possible (there is no delimitation between the 5 pilot sites in the map provided), and announce that geographical coordinates of the project sites will be later informed in the annual reports, as well as the evaluation reports (mid-term and final).</p> <p>4- In table B:</p> <p>4.a- The target 1.1.1 in table B be still need to be quantified.</p> <p>4.b- The table B and the result matrix doesn't mention the area covered by improved land management practices. Please provide this information.</p> <p>4.c- The carbon benefits are missing among the outcomes of component 2 in table B. Please complete.</p> <p>4.c- There seem to be a confusion between outcomes, indicators and targets (ex. target 3.1.1 which doesn't</p>	<p>Coordination mechanism is aimed at mainstreaming all FLR debates and programmes in the CAR. Indicator 4.1 has been modified in order to avoid confusion.</p> <p>5-The full titles have been added to the CER template and information relating to relevant GEF policies highlighted.</p> <p>13 April 2018 All the data have been updated in the table E and B with new numbers (changed to take into consideration the new carbon estimates for indirect impacts of the TRI child project...) The correct figure is know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,221 hectares (Direct) + 4,743 hectares (Indirect) = 7,964 hectares considered as agroforestry restoration operations for SLM in production systems (agricultural lands and plantation sites within the logging concessions) in the different selected areas mentioned in the EXACT calculation table available in Annex B) • 5,886 hectares (D) + 16,346 hectares (I) = 7,964 hectares (Productive ecosystems) + 14,268 hectares (avoided degradation estimates in other forested ecosystems) = 22,232 hectares considered as landscapes better managed and providing biodiversity and ecosystem good and

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>correspond to indicator 3.1 and indicator 4.1 which is an outcome in the PFD). Please revise table B accordingly.</p> <p>5- The sections A.3 and A.4 don't use the complete title as provided in the GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template of August 2016. As a result the boxes included in Stakeholders and Gender issues title are not checked. Please, use the right template for CEO Endorsement and check the appropriate boxes.</p> <p>6- In the table page 11 of the CEO Endorsement Request, the new/additional Bonn Challenge commitment is "x Mha" and the text says "To be defined by the en of 2017". Please update this statement.</p> <p>7- The CEO Endorsement Request contains many acronyms. Please ensure all the acronyms are informed at least when they appear for the first time in the document or in Annex.</p> <p>7 march 2018</p> <p>1- Thank you for the changes. Please organized the part A.1 as per the CEO ER template on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation</p>	<p>services to society (both direct and indirect) in the different selected areas mentioned in the EXACT calculation table available in Annex B).</p> <p>6-The footnote on page 13 of the CER has been corrected. The commitments made by the country will depend on project results, including potential for and location of sites to be restored emanating from the ROAM assessment.</p> <p>7-Acronyms have been spelled out at first use in the document as requested.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>1- Additional subtitles have been inserted in part A.1 of the CER document and the text slightly moved around accordingly.</p> <p>4.b-The 44,131 ha reported in table B of the CER is the sum of both the improved management of landscapes under the BD focal area (34,645 ha) and the land under sustainable management under the LD focal area (9,486 ha). It therefore considers the production landscape and the forest ecosystem representing a KBA. Annex 1 should read Annex A. This has been corrected in the review sheet.</p> <p>13 April 2018 All the data have been updated in the table E</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing; 5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>2- Cleared.</p> <p>3- Cleared.</p> <p>4.a- Cleared.</p> <p>4.b- The area of improved land management practices in table B (44,131 ha) doesn't correspond to the one in table E (2,665 ha direct and 34,645 ha indirect). In addition, there is no Annex 1 in the CEO ER as referred to in the response to the review sheet. Please explain and correct accordingly.</p>	<p>and B with new numbers (changed to take into consideration the new carbon estimates for indirect impacts of the TRI child project...)</p> <p>The correct figure is know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,221 hectares (Direct) + 4,743 hectares (Indirect) = 7,964 hectares considered as agroforestry restoration operations for SLM in production systems (agricultural lands and plantation sites within the logging concessions) in the different selected areas mentioned in the EXACT calculation table available in Annex B) • 5,886 hectares (D) + 16,346 hectares (I) = 7,964 hectares (Productive ecosystems) + 14,268 hectares (avoided degradation estimates in other forested ecosystems) = 22,232 hectares considered as landscapes better managed and providing biodiversity and ecosystem good and services to society (both direct and indirect) in the different selected areas mentioned in the EXACT calculation table available in Annex B).

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>4.c- Cleared.</p> <p>4.d- Cleared.</p> <p>5- Cleared.</p> <p>6- Cleared.</p> <p>7- Cleared.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>1- Thank you for correcting the titles using GEF template. Nevertheless, the sections must be fully explained. A simple reference to the FAO Project Document, in section Part II A.1. 2), isn't satisfactory. In section Part II a.1. 5), all the text doesn't refer to Global Environment Benefit and it is surprising that the text of this section is a copy/past of the section 2.2.2 of the FAO project document which has a different title... We don't understand the numbering O2.1, O2.2, O9.1, O.5... The component description is another copy/paste from the project document without taking care of the GEF format: where are the Annex 11 infra, the part 1.1.3 and the part 2.3.3 as reference in component 2? Please be aware that once recommended by the GEF, the proposal will be circulated for consultation to the GEF</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Council members who expect a fully and clearly understandable document. Please inform the sections as expected according to the GEF template and respecting the title of the sections.</p> <p>4.b- Thank you for the explanation. Nevertheless it is hard to believe that there will not be improved land management as direct benefit of the project. For instance, won't the component 2 result as improved management considering that the outcome 2 is "Integrated landscape management practices and restoration plans implemented"? Shouldn't it be 37,310 ha + 12,707 ha in table B as area under improved land management practices? Please explain and adjust table B accordingly if deemed appropriate.</p> <p>8 May 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the improvements in the project document. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>- The target 2.1.1 of 3,221 ha under restoration appears low as regard to the investment (\$8.7 million including the co-financing). Please explain and explore reconsidering this</p>	<p>-The costs of community-based restoration in the degraded tropical humid forests of the South-West of the CAR have been estimated based on real costs incurred for similar activities in quite similar ecological conditions by the WWF on the surroundings of the Virunga National Park in the DRC (Projects</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>target.</p> <p>- The proposal informs that FAO experts will be paid by the project. Please take into account the GEF rules which consider that there should be a clear separation of Implementation/Supervision and Execution Functions (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01, November 2011 – page 5). Please clarify and adjust accordingly.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.</p>	<p>PEVi Kachéché and Eco-Makala, started in 1987 and still on-going). Full details on these estimates are provided in the Prodoc (page 81 and Annex 12).</p> <p>-The direct reference to FAO expertise has been taken out where it was mentioned. FAO abides to its fiduciary standards and does not cover the costs of FAO staff with trust fund grant money. Whenever FAO expertise is meant to be deployed in projects (for punctual and specific delivery of technical support that goes beyond the roles and responsibilities of FAO as GEF Agency), independent consultants are being deployed. FAO expertise had been mentioned explicitly, as the intention is to use FAO signature tools and approaches, such as Collect Earth Open Foris.</p>
	<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>	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>Risks and mitigation measures are identified. However, the environmental and social risks identified doesn't include mitigation action and the possible climate related risks are not mentioned. Please explain and complete accordingly.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification. We understand from section A.5 that there is no identified environmental risk jeopardizing the success of the project</p>	<p>The table provided on FAOs environmental and social safeguards to be triggered is confusion and has been taken out of the CER. It is explained in full in the project document. Indeed, a distinction needs to be made between risks jeopardizing the success of the project (requested in section A.5 of the CER) and potential risks emanating from the project (relating to the Environmental and Social Safeguards of FAO).</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the suggestion. A climate related risk has been added to the list.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(climate change, fires, diseases...). Please consider this assumption and complete if deemed relevant.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Cleared.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>No, the co-financing letter from FAO is missing (for Grant and In-Kind). In addition, in his letter, the Minister of Environment informs that he can't sign such a letter and actually the joined co-financing letter isn't signed. Please provide a signed co-financing letter from each identified co-financier.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for providing the co-financing letters. Cleared.</p>	We apologize for the error. The correct letters have been attached.
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>Yes. Nevertheless, please consider the following comments:</p> <p>1- There are inconsistencies between the tracking tools and the other documents (for instance: 4 pilote sites are mentioned in the LD outcome table; direct carbon benefits are 3,185,597 tCO₂eq in the tracking tools</p>	<p>1. It has been clarified in the LD tracking tools that there are indeed 5 sites: Community-based FLR in 4 pilot sites + PPP for FLR between SEFCA, Local Communities and the CAR Government in 1 other pilot site. In Table F of the CER a total 36,674,856 tCO₂e is mentioned as this is the sum of the direct (3,185,597 tCO₂e) and the indirect (33,489,259 tCO₂e) benefits coming from the EX-Act calculations in Annex B. The male/female beneficiaries figures have</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and 36,674,856 tCO₂eq in the table F of CEO Endorsement Request, male/female numbers of beneficiaries...). Furthermore, the LD_GEBs and social benefits sheet is not informed for the carbon benefits. Please revise the consistency of the documents and complete as necessary.</p> <p>2- It is unclear what corresponds to BD vs production landscape benefits as in the BD sheet of the tracking tools, the benefits are 3,221 ha direct and 44,131 indirect while in table E of the CEO Endorsement Request, each number belongs to a different category of benefits. Please explain and correct accordingly.</p> <p>3- The avoided deforestation of 2,665 ha seems to be calculated considering 4,295 households while the project target 3,000 households. Please explain and adjust if necessary.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>1- As potential risk with high impact, the project identified the "Poor appropriation of the Project objectives by the local communities and poor interest in implementing field activities". The indirect environmental benefits are relatively high (as</p>	<p>been updated considering that in average 1HH has 5 members so 15 000 individuals will be impacted (as we are keeping the 3,000 HH target). The LD tracking tools have been completed with carbon benefits. And other discrepancies have been addressed.</p> <p>2. Corrected in Table E and the BD TT– We consider that avoided deforestation is the activity which will deliver the highest BD benefits so we included in the target all the ha (direct + indirect) where deforestation will be avoided.</p> <p>3. Explanation has been added in the text. In the target, the number of households directly benefiting from the project has been rounded up from the 2,961 to 3,000. It includes all the households with which agroforestry practices will be undertaken on 2,221 ha. To calculate the avoided deforestation we also included all the households around SEFCA (where 1000 ha will be planted) which awareness will be raised on forest benefits. There are an estimated additional 1,334 households. So we used the 2,961+1334=4,295 households to calculate the avoided deforestation.</p> <p>8 March 2018 Thank you for the inputs. We fully understand the reasoning of the comment and had made a similar consideration when preparing hypotheses for indirect benefit calculations.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>compared to similar GEF investments) and the agency should assess the relevancy to take into account that risk, considering a risk factor leading to more conservative results (in terms of ha and CO2eq). Please consider that risk and adjust accordingly if a more conservative result is estimated appropriate.</p> <p>2, 3- Thank you for the clarification and adjustments. Cleared.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the explanation. We strongly rely on FAO expertise and assumptions and we clear this comment. We invite nevertheless the Agency to note that the overall result in terms of climate mitigation benefits is very high as compared to similar GEF investments.</p> <p>8 May 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the new and more conservative estimates of carbon benefits. Cleared.</p>	<p>Therefore, note that a very conservative approach had already been taken, fully aware of the context in which the project operates. Firstly, the project will work with volunteering households (not imposed by their geographic location only) within a wider landscape. Therefore a higher rate of adoption and retention of technologies and approaches can be expected. Secondly, the solutions offered by the project have strong socio-economic benefits, on top of the GEBs, and therefore offer reason for beneficiaries to sustain results through time. Thirdly, cost of replication is virtually zero, making it accessible to poor communities. In terms of replication, it was estimated that for each participating HH in the project, another would replicate techniques and approaches in the years to follow. This is minimal considering the number of households living in the project area and living from the natural resource base. In conclusion, the reasoning behind the indirect benefits estimate (fully developed on page 124 of the ProDoc) is conservative enough to fully address the worries raised in the risk log.</p> <p>13 April 2018</p> <p>The indirect carbon estimates have been fully revised after discussion between the reviewer of the GEF Secretariat and the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) within FAO with a less optimistic scenario both in term of expected indirect replication of FLR options in similar productive ecosystems and in term of avoided</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>deforestation in other ecosystems.</p> <p>The correct figure is now :</p> <p>Direct: 3,185,597tCO₂eq Indirect: 12,005,914 tCO₂eq</p> <p>All tables and annexes of both the CEO Document (Annex B named Project Mitigation Benefits) and the FAO Project Document (Annex 1: Results matrix and EX-ACT calculations) have been updated with these less optimistic hypothesis</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>29 January 2018</p> <p>In the CEO Endorsement Request, the baseline of other related initiatives doesn't appear clearly described and thus the articulation with and incremental reasoning of the GEF project interventions isn't always clear. Please describe clearly the baseline, especially the one related to the co-financier, and explain how the project will work with the baseline to overcome the barriers and contribute the PFD objectives.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the complementary</p>	<p>On pages 9-10 of the CER template, the incremental cost reasoning has been explained per component, summarizing the information provided in the component description of the project.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		information provided. Cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	29 January 2018 Yes. Cleared.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	29 January 2018 Yes. Cleared.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	29 January 2018 No specific comments to address after the approval of the PFD. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	29 January 2018 Please add a table in Annex B explaining how the PFD level comments (GEF ID#9264) submitted by STAP, which are relevant to the project, are addressed. 8 March 2018 The added answers in the Annex C of the CEO ER are mostly those directly copied from the Global child project. Please address the STAP comments specifically as you consider they are relevant for this project.	Responses have been added in Annex C of the CER template. 8 March 2018 The error stems from the fact that TRI child projects had not been reviewed at PIF stage individually. Instead, the PFD was commented upon, and comprehensive answers to these questions have been proposed. Reference to Kenya and UNEP has been deleted from the answers. Where possible, answers have been tailored in order to reflect specificities of the CAR project.

³ 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
		<p>In addition, one response says "The TRI child project in Kenya, will closely collaborate with other child projects under the TRI initiative in general and with UNEP's child project in Kenya in particular". We don't understand why Kenya and UNEP are mentioned here... Please explain.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>Please add a table in Annex B explaining how the PFD level comments (GEF ID#9264) submitted by Council, which are relevant to the project, are addressed.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>The added answers in the Annex C of the CEO ER are mostly those directly copied from the Global child project. Please address the Council comments specifically as you consider they are relevant for this project.</p> <p>In addition, please note that the comments from France are missing.</p>	<p>Responses have been added in Annex C of the CER template.</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>The comments from France have been addressed.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please consider these comments too.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>29 January 2018</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the comments above and provide a new version of the CEO Endorsement Request where the changes are highlighted (in addition to a clean version).</p> <p>8 March 2018</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>23 March 2018</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>8 May 2018</p> <p>The comments have been addressed, thank you. Yes, the CEO endorsement is now recommended.</p> <p>In addition, please note that the purchase of vehicle and maintenance that is planned in the budget is</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		accepted considering the arguments provided by the Agency on April, 30th, and justifying this option due to the exceptionally difficult economic situation of the country and as a condition for the project success.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		