



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

GEF ID:	9555		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Sustainable Productive Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	159835 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$275,229	Project Grant:	\$21,862,385
Co-financing:	\$139,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$161,162,385
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 03, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Christopher James Warner

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>July 18, 2016</p> <p>The project is not aligned with the IW FA strategy, therefore the project is not eligible for IW funding due to the nature of the proposed investments, the fact that the states identified for investments are primarily inland regions, and the general lack of transboundary issues identified to be tackled by the investment.</p> <p>The project may be aligned with the GEF</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
		<p>focal area strategies and the related programs, however the overall lack of clarity and specifics in the project design precludes an analysis of this issue. Therefore, please provide a more specific discussion of the alignment of the project with each focal area and specifically how the project responds to BD-4 program nine, CCM-2 program four, SFM-Program 2, LD-3 Program 4 and which activities or practices are planned under each with concrete references to the GEF strategy.</p> <p>Please also note comments below on how the key results indicators must be revised to reflect focal area outcomes and associated indicators.</p> <p>Please identify, once the documents are revised, what Aichi Targets the project will help achieve.</p> <p>August 30, 2016 Comments cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>July 18, 2016</p> <p>Please identify how the project specifically responds to and is consistent with the Mexico's NBSAP and the NAP under the UNCCD. Only the INDC is mentioned under the UNFCCC.</p> <p>August 30, 2016 Comments cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate	July 18, 2016	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>No, the project does not sufficiently indicate the drivers of global environmental degradation that the project will address, nor does it adequately discuss sustainability, market transformation, scaling or innovation.</p> <p>The documents do not present a sound GEF project design and this precludes the ability of the document to address these critical issues.</p> <p>Overall, cost effectiveness seems very poor. The project is spending about \$25 per hectare to achieve its coverage target of 3.5 million hectares. This seems entirely unsustainable. Please clarify why the cost per hectare is so high when mainstreaming actions are normally less expensive than that and given the nature of the investment being focused on process and mechanisms based on what is presented in the documents.</p> <p>Please see questions four and five which provide guidance on how to address various gaps and weaknesses in the current design. While undertaking the necessary revisions based on this guidance, please ensure that the issues here (drivers of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation) are systematically and thoroughly addressed.</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>August 30, 2016 Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>July 18, 2016</p> <p>No. Incremental reasoning and justification for a GEF investment can only be properly developed once a proper logic is presented by the project detailing the analysis of the problem to be addressed at the project sites, describing the baseline at the project sites, and the global environmental benefits to be delivered by each focal area at the sites as a result of the GEF increment. The document fails to do any of this adequately.</p> <p>The following analysis provides guidance on revising the document. Please also see comments under question 5, which will provide further guidance on project design.</p> <p>The project Annex and parts of the concept note provide a limited description of the criteria for selection of the seven "priority regions" and justifies their global significance from a biodiversity perspective. However, these "priority regions" are very large and include entire states, sometimes two states, and it is not clear exactly where in these "priority regions" the GEF will invest. Some regions already have considerable GEF investment and we are unable to understand if overlap or complementarity exists with these investments.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>When the revised documents are developed include a comprehensive map with each site identified within each of the seven priority regions. In addition, as noted below, a summary of the BD significance of each site within the seven priority regions, the drivers of loss in each site, the baseline investment in each site, is required. CONABIO likely has some of this information in their database.</p> <p>The document only provides a description of mechanisms and processes that will be implemented in the seven priority regions and that could be implemented anywhere in the world. In addition, the document fails to adequately discuss what Mexico has learned from previous GEF investments attempting to implement similar approaches dating back to the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Program, various PES investments, and other biodiversity mainstreaming projects and how this design specifically builds on lessons learned on sustainability, project design strategies, etc.. While we appreciate the references to the IEO study recently completed, the document should also discuss what has been learned over the last 20 years of GEF investments in Mexico using similar approaches and how this is reflected in the current project design and intervention strategies at the site level.</p> <p>The document provides no actual information on the seven priority regions in terms of what</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>is happening on the ground in each and within the project intervention sites within the seven regions. There is no discussion of the specific drivers of environmental degradation in each of the regions and what the project response will be to address these drivers in specific sites. This is the very essence of any GEF project design. The document simply presents a generic approach to landscape management to be employed in seven priority regions of global biodiversity importance. This is inadequate.</p> <p>As with any GEF investment in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, land, forest management, or fisheries management, the document must identify what are the drivers of environmental degradation in the sites where GEF will invest, what the baseline investments and projects currently under implementation are to manage the resources that are the concern of GEF (biodiversity, land, water resources, forests, etc.) and then what the GEF is being requested to fund to complement the baseline (the GEF increment) in order to reverse the drivers of loss and to generate global environmental benefits. It appears that the participating agencies completed a questionnaire that might provide some of this information for each of the sites as generally referenced in the Annex.</p> <p>Generally speaking, the document presents agriculture as a critical driver of</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>environmental degradation at a national level but at the site level, and given the significant request for SFM resources, one would think pressures on forests might also be a driver, but the document is silent on what sectors are driving degradation at the sites within the seven priority regions and thus, the entry points for the GEF investment to mainstream biodiversity at each site are not clear and thus the incremental nature of the GEF investment is impossible to ascertain.</p> <p>Given that the documents lack a proper analysis of the drivers of biodiversity and forest loss, and land degradation, it must be revised to provide a problem analysis of the sites within the seven priority regions in order that incremental reasoning for the intervention strategy for each individual site can be presented with a greater level of specifics and details than is currently presented. Therefore, please revise the documents accordingly.</p> <p>Regarding key results, the current formulation is inadequate and does not align with the outcomes in the GEF data sheet nor GEF objectives and outcomes in the GEF FA strategies.</p> <p>First, regarding this result: "Area (in ha, including land and water) under integrated landscape management" only provides minimal information on the level of effort of</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the project. The result must be a quantitative and qualitative measure of the condition of these hectares and not a measure of the management approach employed. Please see the GEF BD strategy under BD-4, program nine and the associated outcomes and indicators. (investment amount: \$69 million)</p> <p>Second, GHG emissions reduced must be included as result. The document has to provide an estimate and the methodology/assumptions that were used to arrive at the estimate. (investment amount: \$21 million)</p> <p>Third, the key result related to SLM under the Land Degradation focal area must be listed here. What will be the result measured for the 500,000 hectares of SLM in terms of the quantitative and qualitative condition of these hectares? (investment amount: \$20 million)</p> <p>Fourth, what is the key result from Sustainable Forest Management? (investment amount: \$52 million). Please also clarify for each site where SFM resources are being invested the hectares of each forest type that will benefit and their global importance and conservation value.</p> <p>For GEF, these two "results", are simply outputs that lead to higher level objectives of the project: Inter-agency models for integrated landscape management adopted</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(number of agents adopting) and Financial and market instruments used (number) for promoting integrated landscape management. We recommend deletion.</p> <p>August 31, 2016</p> <p>The document is much stronger now and the narrative and theory of change is described better. Objectives, outcomes, etc all clearer and more robust.</p> <p>However, there are still some missing details, some of which can be addressed at the CEO endorsement stage, but some of which we would like to know now:</p> <p>- Component 1: The PID ISDS notes that 50 programs need to be harmonized. In the concept note, can you list these programs in a footnote at least or tell us what the programs are by Ministry or field (forestry, agriculture, rural development, etc). This is an important part of the project baseline in many ways, but you have provided no information about it. We need some indication of what these programs are and what kinds of policy and regulatory frameworks will be needed to enable this at the national, state, and/or municipal level at the PID ISDS stage with some mention on how this will be further elaborated at CEO endorsement.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Component 2: What agencies are responsible for strengthening capacities? What specific capacities regarding landscape governance are missing? Will these be directed to producers and producer associations only in the project sites or scaled up beyond that? Here, we just want a little more clarity in the PID ISDS.</p> <p>- Component 3: This is the largest component with a lot of different elements to develop a sustainable market for the targeted production systems, yet we imagine these would look very different depending on the type of product. Since most of the GEBs would be resulting from the concrete outputs in this component, by the time of CEO endorsement, we will need more details on the value chains that are being targeted and how it will result in GEBs. For the PID ISDS, some reference to how you will do this in project preparation in a footnote would be useful.</p> <p>- The discussion at the end of page 6 and on page 7 describes what the project is trying to do and how, but does not present the baseline of what is present and ongoing in Mexico in terms of landscape connectivity, forest management and production systems, the market for products and services produced by smallholder farmers, foresters and communities, and what are the barriers this project is trying to address. You need to emphasize that more in this section. But this</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>is maybe in the Annex II to some degree? So in the PID ISDS, some more details here would be helpful. Then of course at CEO endorsement, we would expect this to be fully elaborated.</p> <p>September 2, 2016 All comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>July 18, 2016</p> <p>No. The components are not adequately articulated either in Table B or the associated parts of the documents.</p> <p>The project objective should be rewritten. The objective of the project is not to promote integrated landscape management, this is merely the means to the end. The new formulation should be simpler but also include more details:</p> <p>Sustainable production (of what? Please identify what will be sustainably produced) and resource conservation (what resources? Isn't the purpose to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity as well?) in priority regions of Mexico.</p> <p>Given the considerable amount of resources being invested by the biodiversity focal area and the considerable amount of resources being requested for sustainable forest management from the SFM program of the GEF it is surprising that neither the word</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>biodiversity or forests appears in the project objective. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>This supporting text under the PDO does not make any sense and adds no real value so just delete it:                      "This will be achieved through a multi-focal approach that includes: 1) provision of ecosystem connectivity services, including coastal and marine habitats; 2) mainstreaming biodiversity and CC resilience; 3) supporting mitigation and sustainable land and forestry management."</p> <p>As noted in other comments, once a proper baseline analysis is undertaken, the project designers may discover in certain sites, the investment strategy may focus on certain elements of what the project defines as "integrated landscape management" as opposed to the entire suite of possible actions under this approach.</p> <p>The component titles are not very helpful and do not correlate with the outcomes in a clear way. Some of the language is quite opaque, such as "productive reconversion". Please clarify.</p> <p>While the component titles seem very soft in orientation (mainly enabling activity type descriptions), the outcomes are quite robust and ambitious with very tangible on the ground results. We recommend finding</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>clearer component titles just from a pure communication standpoint.</p> <p>While project level outcomes will by necessity include an array of project level indicators that are specific to the ecology of the particular sites and thus will vary from the GEF focal area outcomes, we expect that outcomes from the GEF focal area results framework would be included. Thus, for example, under BD-4 Program Nine, to cite one example, the outcomes and indicators are:</p> <p>Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management.</p> <p>Indicator 9.1 Production landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management preferably demonstrated by meeting national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) or supported by other objective data.</p> <p>Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations.</p> <p>Indicator 9.2 The degree to which sector policies and regulatory frameworks</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>incorporate biodiversity considerations and implement the regulations.</p> <p>Please include these and the other relevant outcomes and indicators for the various programs from the focal areas that are funding this project such as GHG emission reductions for climate change, SLM area for land degradation, and hectares under SFM.</p> <p>Many outcomes are duplicatory and repetitive and there are simply too many of them. Please reduce as advised below.</p> <p>Component One: Integrated Landscape Management:</p> <p>These first two seem to overlap and can be combined focusing on the relevant outcomes from the GEF BD Focal area as noted above, as well as the SFM program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Globally relevant biodiversity conserved through sustainable and diversified use of terrestrial and fresh water and coastal ecosystems.</li> <li>• Productive land and seascapes with conserved ecosystems based on the application of instruments to curb the process of deterioration (payment for environmental services and voluntarily intended areas for conservation) and promote the sustainable use of biodiversity in particular those associated</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>with costal, marine and forest ecosystems</p> <p>The outcome below on connectivity is related to the two above, but introduces a coverage target, which raises the question of what else will be achieved vis a vis outcomes in the 3 million hectares. Certainly it will be more than "connectivity", but also biodiversity will be conserved or sustainably used and we assume that a certain area will be under sustainable forest management given the investment of \$69 million dollars into BD-4, Program Nine and \$52 million into SFM-2. Please revise accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced connectivity between protected areas, including areas under forest management, coastal and marine habitats and sites of high biodiversity value in 3,000,000 hectares in priority regions.</li> <li>• This outcome seems redundant to the ones above. Why is it needed? "Area with territorial matrices with integrated management of landscape, with ecological connectivity where the benefit of ecosystem services and sustainable production is encouraged."</li> </ul> <p>*****</p> <p>The following four outcomes seem to be trying to measure the same change, or at the very least, overlap considerably. We recommend that the project reduces and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>refines the number of outcomes from this list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This outcome is vague, what does it really mean? What will be sustainably produced? "Increased sustainable productivity through its natural, social and economic aspects, as well as economic, financial and market considerations."</li> <li>• Overlapping outcome: "Increased social and economic productivity from productive partnerships and financial mechanisms to develop inclusive and environmentally friendly economic practices."</li> <li>• This outcome seems redundant to the one above, recommend finding a way for one outcome on this element: "Integration and increased biodiversity friendly production incorporated as the guiding principle for sustainable production and consumption chains."</li> <li>• This outcome seems redundant or partially overlapping to the two above: "Consolidation of financial and market instruments that incorporate economic, social and environmental criteria directed to sustainable landscape use."</li> </ul> <p>*****</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Enhanced ecosystem services</li> </ul>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(habitat, carbon sequestration, hydrological function and health, resilience to climate change)."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isn't this outcome the same as the one above it? Delete this one or combine them: "Enhanced forest ecosystem services through improved management models and forestry production systems at the landscape level."</li> </ul> <p>*****</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will you measure this: "Increased climate change resilience by unifying elements for ecological connectivity, and fostering ecosystem services to benefit sustainable production."</li> </ul> <p>Component Two: Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public policy on rural landscape sustainability guided by inter-agency models for integrated landscape management. Please clarify what is "rural landscape sustainability".</li> <li>Improved knowledge management through i) Meso-regional information systems to support landscape planning, and consensual decisions and evaluation of processes and impacts; ii) Local-level monitoring systems to guide the policy-making process and adaptive management.</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the project measure this outcome? Isn't it more of the means to achieve outcomes in the productive landscape? Who are the custodians of biodiversity in this sentence? Aren't all non-state actors the private sector in the public-private partnerships? Recommend not raising this to an outcome level: "Creation and strengthening of new public-private partnerships between the productive sectors and the custodians of biodiversity".</li> <li>• This is not an outcome: "Promote the implementation of Integrated Coastal Management with multiple stakeholders."</li> </ul> <p>August 31, 2016</p> <p>Most comments cleared. Please address the comments below:</p> <p>Table F and GEBs – I mentioned this issue in my previous email. There is no explanation of the methodology and assumptions behind the targeted amount for GHG emissions reduction. We also could not trace the number of hectares under improved BD and SLM management from the hectares identified by the proposed project sites which total 12 million in the Priority Region Table. In terms of climate change, a footnote explaining where the GHG emissions reduction are coming from (specifically state</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the activities whether it is avoided deforestation, reforestation, etc.) and a sense of how the number was estimated is needed. The number itself is conservative and seems appropriate, we just need to know where it came from and of course that it will be revised during project preparation once the local projects are defined.</p> <p>Financing “ the total in the PCN adds up to almost \$180 million, while in the datasheet it adds up to \$164 million “ the difference is in the amount assigned to the Borrower which is listed as \$140 million, but I do not know why that difference is not listed in the GEF Datasheet. Please clarify.</p> <p>September 2, 2016 All comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>July 18, 2016</p> <p>The document addresses the issue of gender in a generic way. Please improve this section with more detail and specifics.</p> <p>Please describe how CSOs have been consulted and the project's strategy for inclusion and involvement of indigenous peoples.</p> <p>August 30, 2016 Comments cleared.</p>	
<p><b>Availability of Resources</b></p>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the</p>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	September 1, 2016 Yes, the project is requesting \$16,229,586 from Mexico's STAR allocation, plus \$7,900,414 from the SFM incentive, totaling \$24,130,000.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	September 1, 2016 Yes, the project is requesting \$11,233,195 from Mexico's BD STAR allocation, \$2,963,196 from CCM, and \$2,033,195 from LD, plus \$7,900,414 from the SFM incentive, corresponding to 2:1 ratio.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	July 18, 2106  The project is not being recommended for clearance. Numerous issues must be addressed as detailed above.  In addition, the following issues arose that must be addressed:  1) Programming of Funds missing in Finance Breakdown 2) Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ 3) PIF / PFD - Total Fee exceeds 9 percent (limit for this type of project or PFD)	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4) Executing Agency Missing--please provide                      5) Focal point endorsement letter is missing--please provide</p> <p>August 31, 2016                      1), 2) and 3) Not cleared. There are remaining issues in the datasheet:                      -In the first table, the Project Agency Fee should reflect the Agency Fee that corresponds to the requested grant, not the whole amount including PPG, therefore it should be \$1,967,615 not \$1,992,386                      -In table B, Component 4 for Project Management includes the Project Management Cost and M&amp;E activities. These need to be split up so we can ensure that the Project Management Cost is within the limits, in this case up to 5% of the subtotal. The Project Management Cost is thus included at the end of Table B, below the subtotal. -In Table D, the first entry for biodiversity is 10,147 and then the rest of the number disappears. Please fix the formatting problem.                      -In Table E, the PPG grant request is not 300,000 but it is 275,229. Correct it.                      -In Table E, the entire PPG cannot be charged to SFM as then that impacts the 2:1 ratio. Please recalculate.</p> <p>4) Not addressed yet, please add Executing Agencies.                      5) Please provide an English translation of the letter as well for internal operations</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		processed.  September 2, 2016 All comments cleared. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 30, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 02, 2016	

<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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

<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>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		