



Increased resilience and adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable communities to climate change in Forested Guinea

Basic Information

GEF ID

10160

Countries

Guinea

Project Title

Increased resilience and adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable communities to climate change in Forested Guinea

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6016

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Objective CCA-1 has been chosen, however activities under components 2 and 3 seems to correspond to CCA-2 and CCA-3.

Recommended action: Please consider also selecting CCA-2 and CCA-3 in Table A.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2019 - Cleared.

Agency Response

HD, 4/18/2019: Noted, the documentation will include those justifications. CCA-2 and CCA-3 in Table A have been selected.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Please remove references to the AMAT, as in GEF-7 we are transitioning to the use of the LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators, as discussed at the inter-agency retreat and the ATF task force meetings. Additionally, more information regarding output 2.1 under component 2 would be appreciated. It seems to be supporting capacity building for micro-finance/local financial institutions to access climate finance from MDBs, but this is not totally clear from the text.

Recommended action: Please provide more detailed information regarding activities under component 2.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided additional information on both output 2.1 and output 2.2, which support MFOLIs and NGOs/CSOs in understanding and accessing climate finance for CSA investments.

Note - the references to the AMAT are still in the submission at the moment.

Recommended action: Please kindly remove all references to the AMAT from the submission.

GEFSEC, 8/29/2019 - Cleared. AMAT references have been removed.

Agency Response

HD, 5/06/2019: The mention to the AMAT has been removed from the PIF and the component 2 has been revised to provide more details on the activities of the component (pp 16,17).

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Clarification requested. Some of the projects being utilized as co-financing are either in their last year or have terminated (SARA project, 2016-2019). Additionally, on what basis is the co-financing labeled as "investment mobilized" classified as such?

Recommended action: Please ensure projects identified as providing co-financing are current and ongoing. Please describe the "investment mobilized" co-financing in more detail.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Not clear. While different entities may have varying definitions of what is considered investment mobilized, within this context; **Recurrent expenditure** on goods and services is **expenditure**, which does not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets (new or second-hand). It consists mainly of **expenditure** on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation). From the justification provided under Table C regarding the co-financing provided at the moment, it is not clear on what basis the different co-financing is labeled as investment mobilized or recurrent expenditure. Additionally, the table in the text regarding baseline initiatives providing co-financing and the amounts contributed do not match the information provided in Table C.

Recommended action: Please elaborate in the justification provided on how and why those co-financing contributions labeled as "investment mobilized" are so, based on the definition provided above; and please ensure that the co-financing presented in the submission is clear and consistent across different sections.

GEFSEC, 8/29/2019 - This is not clear. There is a lot written in this space describing the baseline investment but does not clearly indicate what exactly makes the co-financing qualify as investment mobilized. The acquisition of cars and vehicles for project implementation are not fixed assets.

Recommended action: Please briefly expound on how the co-financing is resulting in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets on goods and remove the reference to vehicles from the body of the PIF.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided more detail regarding its definition of investment mobilized and removed reference to vehicles from the body of the PIF.

Agency Response

HD, 5/06/2019: The SARA and PNAFA projects have been removed from the co-financing projects and all co-financing project are current and ongoing.

The investment mobilized co-financing has been described in more detail (please see pp 5 and 6)

JP, 5Aug2019: This has been revised to provide justification on how the co-financing is labelled "Investment mobilized" and the co-financing presented is clear and consistent across the different sections. Please see pages 5 and 6.

JS, 22 October 2019: References to vehicles have been removed from the text and will not be included in the CEO ER. The co-financing has been further described and clarified and some detailed information on government investment plans has been removed as they were irrelevant to the section. The differentiation between investments and recurring expenditures has been made clearer in the text to explain where specific co-financing will result in the provision of fixed assets contributing to project activities.

JS, 31 October 2019: For co-financing from the private sector and civil society organizations shown as both in-kind and investment mobilized, we changed the type to grant / investment mobilized. There were confusions reading the co-financing definition as to whether this co-financing qualified as an investment mobilized or recurrent expenditures. Now these have been corrected accordingly.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. Guinea is eligible to access up to \$10 million from the LDCF under the current GEF-7 cap.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. Guinea is currently eligible to access up to \$10 million under the new 2018-2022 LDCF-SCCF strategy.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Gefsec, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The PPG is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

JS, 31 October 2019: PPG information have been re-entered in the submission.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - In line with the Adaptation Program's efforts to align more closely with GEF Trust Fund procedures, we have developed four Core Indicators for PIF-stage (as well as subsequent-stage) submissions to the LDCF and SCCF. These will also contribute to an adaptation section of the [GEF Corporate Scorecard](#). Due to overwhelming demands on the Portal at the moment which preclude our being able to program them in, we would like you to please include a separate brief document (can be just a page) in your GEF-7 LDCF/SCCF PIF submissions to us, titled "Core Indicators".

The four **Core LDCF/SCCF Indicators** are:

1) Number of direct beneficiaries (gender-segregated, M/F)

Please include a breakdown of male/female beneficiaries. Please also note that "direct beneficiaries" in this case are those that directly benefit from adaptation technologies, improved livelihoods, climate-resilient facilities/infrastructure, and those with significantly reduced vulnerability to climatic hazards due to new or enhanced early warning systems. It does not include recipients of trainings or awareness-raising efforts (which is captured by Core Indicator 4, below). It also does not include an entire community far downstream of an area where a riverbank protection measure has been installed/improved, or the entire group of people who have downloaded an early warning app on their phones (many of whom may not necessarily be vulnerable).

2. Number of hectares of land under climate-resilient management

Please provide numbers for this indicator in hectares only. This indicator has been selected due to the large volume of LDCF/SCCF projects in the agriculture and food security sectors. If not relevant to the project, please omit.

3. Number of policies, plans and development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience

Please include regional, national, sub-national and sectoral plans that the project will mainstream adaptation in.

4. Number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (gender-segregated, M/F)

This number may include government staff, communities and households, private sector workers, etc. Please include a breakdown of male/female beneficiaries.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The agency has uploaded the core indicators and meta-data information circulated after the ATF meeting on 1 April 2019.

Agency Response

HD, 5/06/2019: A separate brief document providing the project contribution to the Core LDCF/SCCF Indicators has been prepared and is included in the PIF submission. The document provides the number of direct beneficiaries segregated by gender, the Number of hectares of land under climate-resilient management, the number of policies, plans and development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience, the number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (gender-segregated, M/F).

JS, 31 October 2019: The number of direct beneficiaries has been increased to 650,000 taking into account the potential reach of component 3 on climate information. The previous figure of 150,000 beneficiaries (at PIF level), mainly included beneficiaries under component 1 and 2. The total population of Forested Guinea is 1.9 million according to national statistic, we estimate that a quarter of those (about 500,000) can directly benefit from the climate information services of this project to increase their resilience. This brings the estimated number of beneficiaries of this project to 650,000.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The project is tagged with the appropriate keywords.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The proposal goes into detail on the main barriers it aims to address, including: inadequate agro-forestry systems and production methods; limited financial capacity and limited access to credit for the adoption of innovative and resilient technologies; and insufficient integration of hydro-meteorological and agro-ecological information into local decision-making processes. However, the section is very difficult to read and it would be appreciate if the section were edited for clarity.

Recommended action: There seem to be numerous instances in the body where text has been cut and pasted from elsewhere, including food/end notes. Please if possible, break up the text into an easy-to-read format and remove the numbers that are supposed to be footnotes/endnotes from the body.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The root causes are well described and the three main barriers identified (Inadequate agro-forestry systems and production methods; limited financial capacity and access to credit; and inadequate integration of hydro-meteorological and agro-ecological information into decision making processes) are directly addressed by this project.

Agency Response

HD, 5/06/2019: Indeed, the text inputted in the portal has been copied from the word version of the PIF and pasted in the different sections of the portal. The text come with the food/end notes, but we have edited these sections in the resubmission

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - More clarification requested. The amounts of co-financing listed in Table C and in the body of the text are different, as are the amounts listed in the body and the table in the body.

Recommended action: Please remove the SARA project as co-financing and ensure the amounts of co-financing are listed consistently throughout the submission. Additionally, please briefly describe each baseline investment, including it's scope and main activities, so as to provide a more coherent snapshot of the baseline scenario.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Not clear. While this item is partially cleared, as the outdated baseline projects have been removed, the co-financing amounts and sources provided in the text still do not match those in Table C.

Recommended action: Please ensure that the co-financing sources and amounts are consistently listed across the submission. Please refer to Item 3 under Part I of this review sheet.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2019 - This comment is cleared.

Agency Response

HD, 5/06/2019: The SARA and PNAFA projects have been removed and the description of the baseline investments improved (pp 12, 13 and 16).

JP, 5Aug2019: The co-financing tables have been revised to ensure consistency across the PIF. See pages 12, 13, 14, 17 and 19

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The outcomes are indicated in Table A and the alternative scenario describes the activities envisioned under each component.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - More clarification requested. Please see item 1.

Agency Response HD, 5/06/2019: We have edited the part 2 section of the portal in this resubmission

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The additional cost reasoning for each component is adequately described for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Unclear. Information on expected results of core benefits have not been provided.

Recommended action: Please provide expected results measured through the core indicators as referenced in item 6.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The meta-information and core indicators spreadsheet has been submitted and the targets are achievable.

Agency Response

HD, 4/18/2019: We have provided the expected results in a separate brief document included in the PIF submission

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The project proposal describes its activities innovative, while acknowledging that "CSA encompasses a variety of context-specific approaches that do not need to be technologically advanced, sophisticated, or electronic to be 'innovative.'" While CSA builds on an existing technical foundation, the activities are context-specific and delivered as a package, which includes innovative financial tools, and is innovative for Guinea. As for sustainability and scaling up, the project is designed with both principles embedded, and focuses on both training and local ownership, both of which have high replication potential beyond project closure.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. This information is included in Annex A.

Agency Response**Stakeholders**

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. a comprehensive matrix is included in Section 2 outlining the stakeholders engaged and their envisioned roles in project implementation.

Agency Response**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The agency has indicated that gender-based vulnerability assessments will be undertaken in the targeted villages and regions, which will inform the identification and development of gender sensitive activities during PPG.

Agency Response**Private Sector Engagement**

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The project aims to partner with private sector investors and entities through an investment plan and aims to pilot financial schemes, such as mutual granting or mutual savings and climate -indexed insurance). It will be interesting to see whether co-financing or other types or coordination with these private entities is secured at CEO endorsement stage.

Agency Response**Risks**

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - More information requested. While the risk matrix adequately accounts for a number of risks, more elaboration on climate and fiduciary risk would be appreciated.

Recommended action: Please address any potential climate and fiduciary risks and detail the accompanying mitigation/management measures.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared, the above mentioned risks have been added to the submission.

Agency Response

HD, 4/18/2019: The potential climate and fiduciary risks have been identified and mitigation measures proposed in the risk tables and in the relevant outputs 1.2, 2.1, 2.3 and 3.2 (see pp 15, 16, 17 and 18)

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - More information requested. Aside from GEF ID 8023, which has recently been CEO-endorsed, there are 3 other projects being financed by the LDCF in Guinea, but are not mentioned in the proposal. Additionally, Guinea has received money from the GCF readiness program and is participating in the GCF-financed PIDACC/NB project, but there is no mention of either in this proposal, aside from a brief reference in baseline section to the PIDACC.

Recommended action: Please indicate whether the project team is coordinating with the three other projects under implementation in Guinea by UNDP, and how. Please also indicate whether and how the project will coordinate with any GCF-financed projects.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided some text referencing the GCF-financed projects and how it intends on coordinating with it.

Agency Response

HD, 4/18/2019: The 3 other projects and the GCF readiness program have been mentioned in the PIF and strategies for the coordination of these 3 other projects with this LDCF have been proposed in the section coordination. Furthermore, the Ministry of Environment of Guinea has setup a National Coordination Program for Environment Management and Sustainable Development (PEDD). The main responsibility of this institution is to ensure the coordination of the implementation of the Guinea Environment and climate change agenda and also the coordination of this agenda with the other national and sectoral development strategies. This program supported by the different GEF and non-GEF projects will have the responsibility to ensure the coordination of this LDCF project with the other relevant GEF and GCF projects. Additionally, this LDCF project will support the PEDD and the GEF Operational Focal Point to hold joint information and knowledge workshop and joint planning meetings with the other relevant projects. (pp 24,25)

JS, 31 October 2019: Additional details on the coordination mechanism for the project has been introduced in this section that provides information on general roles and responsibilities for project management, and project steering.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - More information requested.

Recommended action - Please indicate how the project will coordinate with and inform the national adaptation plan (NAP) process in Guinea, which was launched in 2016. Additionally, please ensure all of the policies are current and ongoing - for example - provide dates for the PNIASA and the VISION (2015 seems old - is there a new one?). Is there no national climate change policy?

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Clarification requested. While the agency has indicated that the proposed project will support the NAP process in the response below, it would be appreciated if some brief reference to the medium and long-term adaptation planning process is made in the submission itself.

Recommended action - Please refer to the NAP process - and how this project will inform and align with it - in the submission.

GEFSEC, 8/30/2019 - Cleared. The proposed project will support 3 pillars of the NAP general process in Guinea which are respectively: i) Strengthen research capacities and the knowledge-base to inform adaptation planning and decision-making; ii) Facilitate CCA mainstreaming by reinforcing coordination and M&E mechanisms; iii) Expand the national funding mechanism and private sector engagement to increase CCA financing. Through its outputs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 1.2 and 1.4, the proposed LDCF project will support the

implementation of the pillar 1. The outputs 1.1, 1.3,1.4, and 3.4, will contribute to the realization of Guinea NAP pillar 2 on facilitating CCA mainstreaming in key development plans such as the PNIA, the PNIASAN, the PNDA and the PNDES . The outputs 2,1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 will support the realization of the pillar 3 of the NAP on expanding the national CCA funding mechanism.

Agency Response

HD, 4/18/2019: The proposed project will support 3 pillars of the NAP general process which are respectively: i) Strengthen research capacities and the knowledge-base to inform adaptation planning and decision-making; ii) Facilitate CCA mainstreaming by reinforcing coordination and M&E mechanisms; iii) Expand the national funding mechanism and private sector engagement to increase CCA financing. Through its outputs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 1.2 and 1.4, the proposed LDCF project will support the implementation of the pillar 1. The outputs 1.1, 1.3,1.4, and 3.4, will contribute to the realization of Guinea NAP pillar 2 on facilitating CCA mainstreaming. The outputs 2,1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 will support the realization of the pillar 3 of the NAP on expanding the national CCA funding mechanism.

The project management team including the national implementing and executing partners will regularly coordinate with the NAP management team to ensure i) coordination of the activities through joint activities planning and implementation when relevant, and ii) aligned monitoring and reporting to allow proper tracking of the contribution of the proposed LDCF project on the Guinean NAP Process. The PNIASAN (National Investment Plan for Food and Nutrition Security) is the successor of the PNIASA. The PNIASAN covers the period from 2018-2025 and is the action plan of the new version of the PNDA (National Plan for Agriculture Development) which has kept the same nomination and covers the period 2018-2025.

JP, 5Aug2019: The references to the NAP process has been made in the submission itself. See page 27

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The project has a dedicated component for knowledge management, which is adequately detailed for this stage of project development, however, more detail on how the project will create and capture knowledge related to this project will be required at CEO endorsement stage.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/8/2019 - Yes. The project has been endorsed by the current OFP of Guinea.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - It seems the text from previous reviews has disappeared from this box. Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 8/30/2019 -Not yet. Please address item 3 and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2019 - Yes. This project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 10/30/2019 - GEF PPO has reviewed this submission and has flagged the following issues. Please address and resubmit for clearance.

1) On co-financing: some of the in-kind co-financing has been marked as "investment mobilized". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Same applies for "grants": they are typically classified as "investment mobilized" rather than "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)

2)Table E – PPG – is not filled out.

3) On coordination: there is no mention to the executing arrangements – this section only describes coordination with other projects. Please describe the preliminary executing arrangements at this stage.

4) We are requesting that agencies revisit the core indicators/project impact. For the Guinea project, ~150,000 direct beneficiaries for a project requesting \$10 million is comparatively low when looking at the portfolio level. This is particularly true taking into consideration the level of ambition the GCF has set (and with which the GEF hopes to reach parity) -- which is 150 beneficiaries for each billion invested; that would make the aspiration for a \$10m project at around 1 million people. If possible, please revisit the assumptions underlying the indicative numbers provided on the expected beneficiaries.

GEFSEC, 11/1/2019 - The agency has adequately responded to PPO comments and provided updated indicative numbers for the Core Indicators. This proposal is being recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/8/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/12/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/30/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2019	

PIF Recommendation to CEO**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

undefined

