

GEF Council Meeting
June 18 - 20, 2013
Washington D.C.

Agenda Item 9

**REPORT ON THE PILOT ACCREDITATION OF GEF PROJECT
AGENCIES**

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed GEF/C.44/09, *Report on the Pilot Accreditation of GEF Project Agencies*, noted the status of the Stage II reviews conducted by the Accreditation Panel to date. In particular, the Council noted that all Stage II initial desk reviews are expected, as planned, to be completed by June 2013, but also that several applicants are undergoing further reviews by the Panel.

The Council decided to consider the possibility of a second round of accreditation, including accreditation of bilateral agencies, only once all Stage II reviews are completed.

The Council requested the Secretariat to continue to present a progress report on the accreditation pilot at every Council meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In line with the GEF-5 policy recommendation to broaden the GEF Partnership under Paragraph 28 of the GEF Instrument, the Council agreed, in May 2011, to launch a pilot program to accredit “up to ten” new agencies, to be called GEF Project Agencies, to assist countries in implementing GEF financed projects. This paper provides a summary description of the accreditation process, reports on the progress made to date in its implementation and presents an estimated timeline for its completion.

The Accreditation Pilot began in January 2012 after 16 agencies submitted Stage I applications to the Secretariat by December 31, 2011, the deadline announced by the Council for the first round. Based on the outcome of the Stage I Value-added Review of these applicant agencies, the Council in June 2012 approved 11 applicants to progress to the Stage II of the accreditation process.¹

Since June 2012, the independent GEF Accreditation Panel (the Panel) has been conducting Stage II reviews of the applicants in order to assess whether they meet the GEF’s Fiduciary Standards as well as its Environmental and Social Safeguards including Gender Mainstreaming, in line with the criteria established by the Council.

To date, the Panel has conducted initial desk reviews of nine of the 11 applicants. Initial desk reviews of the two agencies (BOAD and IFRC) are currently underway and are expected to be completed by June 2013. Three agencies (DBSA, WWF-US and CI) received *conditional approval*, while five agencies (FUNBIO, CAF, IUCN, FECO and VTB) were asked to undergo *further review* after they have undertaken compliance related institutional improvements as directed by the Panel. One agency (FONAM) was *rejected* by the Panel.

The process of further reviews will run into FY14 as agencies address the compliance issues identified by the Panel. According to the Council approved process, applicants can be given a maximum of 18 months to address identified compliance issues (six months to address fiduciary issues and 12 months to address issues related to compliance with the GEF’s environmental, social safeguards and gender mainstreaming policies). Consequently, given that initial desk reviews for all agencies are expected to be completed in June 2013, it is possible, albeit unlikely, that the last agency will only conclude its Stage II review by December 2014.

The Council had previously agreed to discuss in the June 2013 Council meeting whether a second round of the pilot should be launched, as well as the possibility of including bilateral agencies in the pilot. However, given that consideration of new applications at this time may result in the Pilot exceeding the Council approved target of accrediting up to 10 agencies, the

¹ The 11 agencies are: The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA); Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade- Brazil (FUNBIO); Foreign Economic Cooperation Office – China (FECO); National Environment Fund – Peru (FONAM); VTB Bank – Russian Federation (VTB); Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF); Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD); World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF-US); Conservation International (CI); International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); and International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC).

Secretariat recommends that the Council consider the possibility of a second round of accreditation, including bilateral agencies, only once all Stage II reviews have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Summary of the GEF Accreditation Process to date	1
Establishment of the Pilot: June 2011	1
Preparation for the Pilot: June 2011 – November 2011	2
Launch of the Pilot: November 2011 – December 2011.....	2
Stage I Reviews: January 2012 - June 2012.....	2
Stage II Reviews: June 2012- June 2013	3
Current Status.....	5
Finalizing the Pilot.....	6
Issues before the Council	7

List of Annexes

Annex 1. Progress to Date on Accreditation Panel’s Agency (Stage II) Reviews (as of May 16, 2013).....	8
Annex 2. Expected Timeline of Remaining Initial Desk Reviews and Further Reviews.....	13

INTRODUCTION

1. Broadening of the GEF Partnership is one of the reforms of the Fifth Replenishment (GEF-5). At its 40th meeting in May 2011, the GEF Council decided to implement a two-year GEF-5 Pilot on Broadening the GEF Partnership. Through the Pilot, qualified agencies would be accredited to become GEF Project Agencies in accordance with the provisions set forth in Council document GEF/C.40/09, *Broadening the GEF Partnership under Paragraph 28 of the Instrument*. The accreditation Pilot began on January 1, 2012.
2. This paper provides a summary of the accreditation process, reports on the progress made to date in its implementation and presents an estimated timeline for its completion.

SUMMARY OF THE GEF ACCREDITATION PROCESS TO DATE

Establishment of the Pilot: June 2011

3. Based on inputs from a Council sub-committee, at its 40th meeting, the Council decided to implement the Pilot in accordance with the provisions set forth in document GEF/C.40/09, as amended by the Council during the meeting, including the following:
 - (a) The GEF would accredit up to 10 institutions to serve as GEF Project Agencies. National institutions, regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, United Nations programs and specialized agencies, and other international organizations would be eligible to apply for accreditation as GEF Project Agencies.
 - (b) The GEF would accredit at least five national institutions under the Pilot, and applications from national institutions would therefore have priority. Until the Council has approved at least five national agencies, the Secretariat could review applications from regional organizations and non-governmental organizations but would not review applications from other types of organizations.
 - (c) The Pilot would be implemented as a three-stage accreditation process: (i) Stage I (GEF Value-added Panel Review) for determining the applicants' value-added to the GEF partnership; (ii) Stage II (independent GEF Accreditation Panel Review) for determining the applicants' level of compliance with the GEF's minimum Fiduciary Standards as well as its Environmental and Social Safeguards policies, including Gender Mainstreaming; and (iii) Stage III for formalizing engagement with the GEF by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the GEF Secretariat and a Financial Procedures Agreement (FPA) with the Trustee.
 - (d) The accreditation process would be cost-neutral for the GEF. Consequently applicant agencies would pay fees sufficient to cover the cost of their accreditation;
 - (e) Bilateral agencies would not initially be eligible for accreditation under the Pilot, but their participation would be considered at the first meeting of the Council in 2013.
4. The Council requested the Secretariat, in cooperation with the Trustee, to finalize all necessary arrangements, procedures, and materials for the accreditation of GEF Project Agencies, including establishment of the GEF Accreditation Panel. The Council also requested

the Evaluation Office to initiate an evaluation on the Pilot at the earlier of either: (i) two years after the first five agencies have been accredited; or (ii) January 2015.

Preparation for the Pilot: June 2011 – November 2011

5. During June 2011– November 2011, the Secretariat developed the necessary procedures and materials including Stage I application forms, scoring mechanisms and review guidelines, and constituted an internal GEF Value-added Review Panel.

6. The Secretariat also constituted an independent GEF Accreditation Panel, in December 2011, through a competitive international recruitment process. The work of the Panel commenced on January 26, 2012, when it began developing its rules of procedure and work program as well as the Stage II application form and scoring mechanism and guidelines.

Launch of the Pilot: November 2011 – December 2011

7. With the necessary procedures in place, the Secretariat, in November 2011, announced the Pilot and invited interested parties to apply by December 31, 2011 or by June 30, 2012, the two deadlines set by the Council for the first and second round of Stage I applications, respectively.

8. Sixteen agencies formally submitted completed Stage I applications by the December 31, 2011 deadline.

Stage I Reviews: January 2012 - June 2012

9. Implementation of the Pilot began on January 1, 2012. From January 1, 2012 to May 1, 2012, the GEF Secretariat Value-added Review Panel reviewed the application forms and supporting documentation submitted by 14 of these applicant agencies against the value-added review criteria set forth in the Council document GEF/C.40/09.²

10. In an effort to expedite the accreditation process, the GEF Secretariat also requested, in April 2012, that all 14 applicant agencies submit their Stage II application forms by mid-May 2012, in anticipation of possible Council approval of their progress to Stage II, so that the Accreditation Panel could begin Stage II reviews of Council approved agencies immediately after the June 2012 Council meeting.

11. Based on the passing scores received during the Stage I Value-added Review, 11 applicants were recommended by the GEF Secretariat to the GEF Council for approval at its 42nd meeting in June 2012. The result of the first round of Stage I applications were presented in the Council document GEF/C.42/09/Rev.01 *Secretariat Recommendations of Project Agencies for Accreditation*, dated May 8, 2012. The 11 applicant agencies recommended to the Council were:

- (a) The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA);
- (b) Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade- Brazil (FUNBIO);

² In line with document GEF/C.40/09 which states that “until at least five national agencies have been approved by the Council, the Secretariat may review applications from regional organizations and non-governmental organizations but will not review applications from other types of organizations”, the GEF Secretariat did not undertake reviews of Stage I applications received from UN-HABITAT and WFP.

- (c) Foreign Economic Cooperation Office – China (FECO);
- (d) National Environment Fund – Peru (FONAM);
- (e) VTB Bank – Russian Federation (VTB);
- (f) Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF);
- (g) Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD);
- (h) World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF-US);
- (i) Conservation International (CI);
- (j) International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); and
- (k) International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC).

12. The GEF Council considered document GEF/C.42/09/Rev.01 and approved all recommended 11 applicant agencies to progress on to Stage II of the accreditation process.

13. Given the possibility that all 11 agencies approved by Council at the June 2012 meeting could also receive Stage II approval, resulting in the number of agencies to be granted accreditation as a GEF Project Agency to exceed the target of “up to ten institutions” set forth in the document GEF/C.40/09, the Council also decided to postpone the consideration of a second round of accreditation until its November 2012 meeting.

Stage II Reviews: June 2012- June 2013

14. Complying with the deadline announced by the Secretariat, all 14 applicant agencies had submitted their Stage II application forms to the Secretariat in mid-May 2012. After the 40th meeting of the Council, the 11 Council-approved agencies made their initial fee payments to the Secretariat throughout the summer and fall of 2012.

15. Upon receipt of their application materials and fees, the Secretariat reviewed Stage II application materials submitted by each of the 11 Council-approved applicant agencies to ensure that all sections and questions of the application were answered and that sufficient evidence and information was provided to enable the Accreditation Panel to effectively perform its work. In the process, the Secretariat found that several Stage II applications were incomplete and several agencies had submitted key documentation in languages other than English. Consequently, the Secretariat requested applicant agencies to revise and complete their applications and to resubmit missing materials along with all key documents translated into English.

16. The Accreditation Panel began its Stage II reviews in mid-June 2012, by first considering those agencies that had submitted relatively more complete applications with all key documentation in English (i.e. DBSA, WWF-US and CI).

17. Following the procedures and criteria outlined in Council documents GEF/C.40/09, GEF/C.31/6 *Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies*, GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1, *GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*, and the GEF policy on Gender Mainstreaming included in Annex II of GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1, *GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender*

Mainstreaming, the Accreditation Panel has been first conducting an initial desk review of each applicant and then, issuing a written assessment based on the outcome of this review.

18. The Panel has developed a criteria-based scoring mechanism with four possible review outcomes: (i) approval; (ii) conditional approval, with a grace period to comply with environmental and social safeguards; (iii) further review; and (iv) rejection. The Panel’s written report explains the reasons for the Panel’s assessment in each case and presents the scores received by each agency for each of the review criteria.

Box 1. Possible Outcomes of the Panel’s Initial Desk Review

1. **“Approval”**: An applicant agency that receives the Panel’s “approval” will move on to Stage III of the process where it will sign a MoU with the Secretariat, committing to follow all relevant GEF policies and procedures. In addition, the approved agency will sign a FPA with the GEF Trustee, enabling the Trustee to commit and transfer GEF funds to the agency. At this point, the agency will be considered accredited as a GEF Project Agency with the ability to submit PIFs, receive GEF funding and implement GEF projects.
2. **“Conditional Approval”**: As per paragraph 48 of Council document GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1, the Panel may give “conditional approval” to an applicant agency that has demonstrated its full compliance with the GEF’s Minimum Fiduciary Standards, but does not yet fully comply with the GEF’s Environmental and Social Safeguards, including Gender Mainstreaming. A conditional approval may be granted along with a grace period of up to one year (12 months) for the applicant to complete the necessary steps to fully adhere to the GEF’s Safeguards. In that case, as per paragraph 13 of the Annex 2 of Council document GEF/C.40/09, the applicant may move forward to Stage III and sign an MoU with the GEF Secretariat, on the condition that an FPA with the Trustee cannot be signed until the Panel has confirmed that there is full adherence to all GEF Minimum Standards. Moreover, until all accreditation requirements have been met and an FPA has been signed, the GEF CEO will not endorse any project proposals submitted by such applicant and there will be no commitments and transfers of resources to the applicant.
3. **“Further Review”**: An applicant agency that requires “further review” by the Panel will need to undertake remedial action, submit additional information and undergo further assessment. In such cases, in line with paragraph 11(c) of Annex 2 of the Council document GEF/C.40/09, the Panel will estimate the cost associated with this additional review and the applicant will be requested to submit a payment to cover this cost. An agency can receive up to six (6) months to address the fiduciary compliance issues identified by the Panel during initial desk review and resubmit for further review.
4. **“Rejection”**: An applicant agency recommended for “rejection” does not qualify for accreditation; but may submit a new Stage I application at a later date if the Council decides to hold another round of accreditation, after improving their standards and capabilities in line with the GEF’s requirements. The Panel provides in its assessment an explanation regarding what the rejected applicants will need to do to improve standards and capabilities such that, if they choose to reapply at a later date, they will be better positioned to meet the standards.

19. Based on the outcome of the Panel’s initial desk review, an agency may be granted up to six months in order to complete fiduciary compliance and then, an up to 12 additional months to complete compliance with environmental and social safeguards for a maximum total of 18 months to address identified compliance issues.

CURRENT STATUS

20. To date, the Panel has conducted initial desk reviews of nine of the 11 applicants. Initial desk reviews of the two agencies (BOAD and IFRC) are currently underway and are expected to be completed by June 2013. Three agencies (DBSA, WWF-US and CI) received *conditional approval*, while five agencies (FUNBIO, CAF, IUCN, FECO and VTB) were asked to undergo *further review* after they have undertaken compliance related institutional improvements as directed by the Panel. One agency (FONAM) was *rejected* by the Panel. The current status is shown in Table 1.³

21. As previously reported to the Council, it takes the Panel about one calendar month to conduct the initial desk review of an applicant, implying that such reviews of all 11 applicants would take about 11 months.⁴ Currently, initial desk reviews are consistent with this time-frame and given that the Panel began conducting reviews in mid-June 2012, initial desk reviews of all first round applicants are expected to be completed by June 2013.

Table 1. Status of Stage II Reviews of 11 First Round Agencies

Agencies	Current Status
National (5)	
DBSA	<i>Conditional Approval</i> ; Applicant preparing resubmission
FUNBIO	<i>Further Review</i> ; Panel reviewing submitted documentation
FECO	<i>Further Review</i> ; Panel reviewing submitted documentation
VTB	<i>Further Review</i> ; Applicant preparing resubmission
FONAM	Rejected
Regional (2)	
CAF	<i>Further Review</i> , Applicant preparing resubmission
BOAD	Initial desk review ongoing
International CSO (4)	
WWF	<i>Conditional Approval</i> ; Applicant preparing resubmission
CI	<i>Conditional Approval</i> ; Applicant preparing resubmission
IUCN	<i>Further Review</i> ; Applicant preparing resubmission
IFRC	Initial desk review ongoing.

³ Annex 1 contains more details about the process for individual applicants.

⁴ Council paper GEF/C.43/07 *Progress Report: Accreditation Process for GEF Agencies*, dated October 16, 2012.

22. None of the 11 applicants has been able to demonstrate full compliance with the GEF's Minimum Standards at the initial desk review stage. The Panel has so far identified issues relating to Internal Audit, Financial Disclosure, Project Appraisal Procedures, Procurement, Investigation Function and Hotline and Whistle Blower Protection, Environmental and Social Safeguards, and Gender Mainstreaming Standards. To deal with these issues, the Panel has required the applicants to undertake compliance-related institutional improvements including revision of existing policies, development and adoption of new policies, implementation of new procedures as well as enhancement of in-house capacity to address GEF requirements and to function as a GEF project Agency, and then to revise and resubmit its application. The Panel has provided specific guidance to each of the applicant agencies it has reviewed, regarding what kind of action to take in order to improve institutional capacity to fully comply with the GEF's Minimum Standards. Such Panel guidance included recommendations on how existing policies should be revised, what new policies and procedures should be developed and adopted, and what type of in-house capacity enhancements should be made to address GEF compliance requirements.

FINALIZING THE PILOT

23. The experience to date with the Stage II review process is that it is an iterative process with agencies undertaking remedial work followed by assessments by the Panel.

24. Despite the completion of the initial desk review as scheduled, it is likely that the Pilot will exceed its target two-year time-line. As noted earlier, the maximum amount of time an agency can receive from the Panel to address compliance issues is 18 months after its initial desk review. If one of the two applicants that are currently undergoing initial desk reviews is granted the maximum 18 months to address compliance issues, the Stage II review process will run through December 2014, i.e., one year longer than originally envisaged for the Pilot. Even if the Pilot may not ultimately run until December 2014, considering that five agencies were deemed by the Panel to need "Further Review", it is likely that the Pilot will run beyond the original two-year time-limit which ends in December 2013.

25. In the Secretariat's judgment, increasing the number of Panel members is not likely to speed up significantly the completion of the Pilot. The main reason for this is that the initial desk reviews, which are particularly time-consuming for the Panel, have almost been completed. Therefore, the remaining time is mostly taken up by the applicants responding to the Panel's recommendations rather than by the Panel members' reviews.⁵ Moreover, it would take about three months to conduct an international competitive recruitment process to identify and hire an additional Panel member. Consequently, the Secretariat does not recommend that the number of Panel members be increased.

⁵ For example, in the case of WWF, which is the agency most advanced in the accreditation process, of the 39 weeks that has passed since the Panel issued its initial desk report, about 30 weeks have been spent by WWF to prepare for resubmissions, while only 9 weeks have been spent by the Panel reviewing resubmissions.

Issues before the Council

26. The Council has three issues to consider: (i) whether to open the accreditation process for a second round of applicants; (ii) how to deal with the fact that there are not at least five national agencies, and (iii) whether to include bilateral agencies in the Pilot.⁶

27. Based on the outcome of the Accreditation Panel's Stage II reviews to date, there are still ten agencies under consideration that can potentially be accredited under the Pilot. This would be consistent with the Council's target for the Pilot of accrediting up to 10 agencies. Inviting a second round of applications, including from bilateral agencies, may result in this target to be exceeded. The Council could consider inviting a second round of applications for accreditation from national agencies only, in order to meet the target of accrediting at least five national agencies. This may attract a number of qualified national agencies from around the world, and it is possible that more than one of these applicants will qualify for Stage II Review, resulting again in the possibility of exceeding the Pilot's target.

28. Consequently, given that Stage II reviews of first round of ten applicants under the Pilot are still ongoing, the Secretariat recommends that the Council consider the possibility of a second round of accreditation only once all Stage II reviews have been completed.

⁶ The Council agreed, at its 40th meeting in June 2011 that while bilateral agencies would initially not be eligible for accreditation, their participation in the pilot phase would be considered at its first meeting in 2013.

ANNEX 1. PROGRESS TO DATE ON ACCREDITATION PANEL’S AGENCY (STAGE II) REVIEWS (AS OF MAY 16, 2013)

Agency	Stage I Application submission	Stage II application submission and application fee payment	Request for Stage II Application missing documents and translations	Completed Stage II application submission	Initial Stage II Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Initial Review and additional fee payment	Further Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Further Review	Safeguards Review after Grace Period – Panel Report	Resubmission After Safeguards Review	Interview – Panel Report	Resubmission After Interview	Final Panel Decision
DBSA	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: October 30, 2012	N/A	N/A	July 3, 2012 Passed Fiduciary Did not pass fully Environmental and Social Safeguards Received “Conditional Approval” to with <u>12 months</u> grace period to fix compliance with environmental and social standards Due Date: July 3, 2013	N/A	N/A		Expected in July 2013	N/A	Expected in August 2013	N/A	
WWF-US	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: June 18, 2012	N/A	N/A	July 16, 2012 Did not pass Fiduciary fully Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>3 months</u> to fix compliance and resubmit for “further review” Due date: October 16, 2012	September 18, 2012 Additional Fee Payment: October 8, 2012	October 8, 2012 Passed Fiduciary Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received “Conditional Approval” with <u>6 months</u> grace period to fix compliance With environmental and social standards Due Date:	February 7, 2013	March 20, 2013 Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>3 months</u> to fix remaining items and complete interview with Panel Due date: June 20, 2013	April 9, 2013 Interview Date: April 23, 2013	April 24, 2013 Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>1 month</u> to fix remaining issues Due date: June 1, 2013	May 13, 2013	

Agency	Stage I Application submission	Stage II application submission and application fee payment	Request for Stage II Application missing documents and translations	Completed Stage II application submission	Initial Stage II Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Initial Review and additional fee payment	Further Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Further Review	Safeguards Review after Grace Period – Panel Report	Resubmission After Safeguards Review	Interview – Panel Report	Resubmission After Interview	Final Panel Decision
							April 8, 2013 Signed Interim MoU with GEFSEC on January 10, 2013						
CI	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: June 27, 2012	N/A	N/A	September 5, 2012 Panel could not conduct full review – submission was incomplete. Received <u>3 months</u> to complete and resubmit for further review Due date: December 5, 2012 Panel did not request additional fee for further review.	December 21, 2012	April 30, 2013 Passed Fiduciary Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received “conditional approval” with <u>3 months</u> grace period to fix compliance with environmental and social safeguards Due date: July 30, 2013						
FUNBIO	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: July 17, 2013	August 30, 2012	September 20, 2012	October 25, 2012 Did not pass Fiduciary Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>6 months</u> to fix compliance and resubmit for further review	April 24, 2013	Expected in July 2013						

Agency	Stage I Application submission	Stage II application submission and application fee payment	Request for Stage II Application missing documents and translations	Completed Stage II application submission	Initial Stage II Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Initial Review and additional fee payment	Further Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Further Review	Safeguards Review after Grace Period - Panel Report	Resubmission After Safeguards Review	Interview - Panel Report	Resubmission After Interview	Final Panel Decision
					Due Date: April 25, 2013								
FECO	December 31, 2011	May 17, 2012 Fee payment: July 11, 2012	August 30, 2012	September 27, 2012 October 19, 2012 November 1, 2012	January 10, 2013 Did not pass Fiduciary fully Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>3 months</u> to fix fiduciary compliance and resubmit for further review Due date: April 10, 2013	April 11, 2013	Expected in July 2013						
FONAM	December 31, 2011	May 17, 2012 Fee Payment: August 23, 2012	September 14, 2012	October 30, 2012	January 10, 2013 Did not pass Fiduciary Did not pass Environmental and Social Safeguards Panel did not believe FONAM could fix fiduciary deficiencies within 6 months, the maximum amount of time an agency can receive to fix compliance with fiduciary standards	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Rejected - January 2013
VTB	December 31, 2011	May 22, 2012 and	October 04, 2012	February 27, 2013	May 16, 2013 Did not pass Fiduciary fully		Expected in November 2013						

Agency	Stage I Application submission	Stage II application submission and application fee payment	Request for Stage II Application missing documents and translations	Completed Stage II application submission	Initial Stage II Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Initial Review and additional fee payment	Further Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Further Review	Safeguards Review after Grace Period – Panel Report	Resubmission After Safeguards Review	Interview – Panel Report	Resubmission After Interview	Final Panel Decision
		June 13, 2012 Fee Payment: June 30, 2012			Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>6 months</u> to fix fiduciary compliance and resubmit for further review Due date: November 16, 2013								
BOAD	December 31, 2011	May 22, 2012 Fee payment: June 28, 2012	October 16, 2012	January 31, 2013	Expected in June 2013								
IUCN	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: July 25, 2012	November 29, 2012	December 7, 2012	February 18, 2013 Did not pass Fiduciary fully Did not pass all Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>6 months</u> to complete compliance and resubmit for further review Due Date: August 18, 2013		Expected in September 2013						
CAF	December 31, 2011	May 17, 2012 Fee Payment: July 17,	December 6, 2012	January 31, 2013	April 3, 2013 Did not pass Fiduciary fully Did not pass all		Expected in October 2013						

Agency	Stage I Application submission	Stage II application submission and application fee payment	Request for Stage II Application missing documents and translations	Completed Stage II application submission	Initial Stage II Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Initial Review and additional fee payment	Further Review - Panel Report Date	Resubmission After Further Review	Safeguards Review after Grace Period – Panel Report	Resubmission After Safeguards Review	Interview – Panel Report	Resubmission After Interview	Final Panel Decision
		2012			Environmental and Social Safeguards Received <u>6</u> months to complete compliance and resubmit for further review Due Date: October 3, 2013								
IFRC	December 31, 2011	May 16, 2012 Fee payment: October 19, 2012	January 2, 2013	February 2, 2013	Expected in June 2013								

ANNEX 2. EXPECTED TIMELINE OF REMAINING INITIAL DESK REVIEWS AND FURTHER REVIEWS

Agency	Expected Review Date
BOAD – initial review	June 2013
IFRC – initial review	June 2013
WWF – final review (safeguards)	June 2013
CI – final review (safeguards) and interview	June 2013
FECO – further review	July 2013
FUNBIO – further review	July 2013
DBSA – final review (safeguards) and interview	August 2013
IUCN – further review	August/September 2013
CAF – further review	October 2013
VTB – further review	November 2013
FECO – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to July 2014 (if receives max. time)
FUNBIO – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to July 2014 (if receives max. time)
IUCN – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to August/September 2014 (if receives max. time)
CAF – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to October 2014 (if receives max. time)
VTB – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to November 2014 (if receives max. time)
BOAD – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to December 2014 (if receives max. time)
IFRC – final review (safeguards) and interview	Possible Up to December 2014 (if receives max. time)