

Integrated Adaptation Program to enhance resilience of communities and ecosystems in the dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10364

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Integrated Adaptation Program to enhance resilience of communities and ecosystems in the dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

11/6/2019

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, the project is aligned with the Adaptation Programming Strategy of the GEF for LDCF for the GEF-7 period.

GEFSEC 5 Nov2019 (JS):

Please indicate the original submission date in the correct location.

GEFSEC 6Nov2019 (JS):

Cleared

Agency Response Now updated.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please consider the following:

- Please provide initial intended impact indicators with estimated figures at this PIF stage.
- We encourage a comprehensive approach to "promoting" the update of climate change adaptation technologies through this project, including testing, piloting, and (importantly) commercialization. Please reference this scope and relevant efforts in the PIF. (component 1)

- "Promoting the transfer of adaptation technologies" is an approach to promote "innovations for climate resilient value changes". Please ensure the outcomes, outputs and activities are designed with this in mind. (component 1.1)
- Please ensure focus on identifying, prioritising and designing adaptation solutions to address specified adaptation problems (hazards and their impact), and avoid conducting climate vulnerability assessments as an output in itself. Please approach climate vulnerability assessment in this project as a means to prioritising and designing cost-effective adaptation solutions, but not an end in themselves. A global tendency it will be good to avoid is to do vulnerability assessments that employ people, but do not catalyze and focus decision making and investment for adaptation impact. (outputs 1.1.3; 1.1.4)
- Please ensure climate change solutions and their technologies prioritised and designed focus directly on climate problems, based on hazards and their impacts and risk (outputs 1.1.3; 1.1.4; 1.1.5).
- Please identify ways to ensure all adaptation solutions and the technologies/innovations they use are not only built into landscape management plans, but go further to being built into other adaptation and development planning and (important) public and private investment processes. (1.1.6)
- Please include activities to ensure sustainable access to ICT equipment and services for end users. (output 2.1.3)
- Please clarify the intended meaning of "upscaled through local supply infrastructure and innovations in value addition" in this context. (outcome 3.1)
- ICT? (output 3.2.1)
- Please consider potential and outcomes/outputs for to create innovative finance mechanisms for value chain resilience, including Bonds for resilient production of certain commodities, insurance, and lines of credit for MSMEs. (Outcome 3.2)
- Please explicitly include monitoring and evaluation of adaptation innovations within scope of outcome 4.
- Please include commercialization and financing approaches within the scope of outcome 4.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared. Please note that during the PPG stage, it will be important to ensure focus on design of adaptation solutions based on specified climate hazard and their impacts and risks. Also during PPG stage, it will be important to deepen focus on innovations to finance resilience of agricultural production, be it through Bonds, microfinance providers, insurance, or otherwise, as referenced above and touched on in the resubmitted PIF.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comments and suggestions raised in the above. All points have addressed in the revised PIF. However, in order to maintain the structure of Table B, the majority of comments have been addressed in section 1 Part 3, in the description of the project's components, outcomes and outputs - please refer to the revised PIF, page 15-18 (all revisions are highlighted in yellow).

As requested, please find below some additional clarification regarding one specific comment: - Please clarify the intended meaning of "upscaled through local supply infrastructure and innovations in value addition" in this context. (outcome 3.1).

This outcome (Climate resilient post-harvest technologies upscaled through local supply infrastructure and innovations in value addition) refers to the intended uptake and deployment/commercialization of hard and soft technologies as well as organizational/institutional arrangements to improve post-harvest systems/the supply infrastructure - it does not refer to physical infrastructure (such as roads, bridges, ect.)

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please provide a description of how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2019 (PPO):

Some grant co-financing has been marked as "recurrent expenditures". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "grant", it should typically be classified as "investment mobilized " rather than "recurrent expenditures ". Please change the co-finance categorization for Agency FAO and Donor Agency EU to

"investment mobilized", or provide a detailed explanation of why either or both are better categorized "as recurrent expenditures". Further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)

GEFSEC 6Nov2019 (JS):

Cleared

Agency Response

The co-financing sources have been identified during the PIF preparation and those that are not recurrent expenditures are defined as investment mobilized - those sources are listed below table C.

For a detailed breakdown of the co-finance, please refer to the table in section 2.2 of the PIF.

Please see further clarification regarding the investment mobilized in the revised PIF as well as in the below (highlighted in green):

The investment mobilized are considered, as per GEF definition, not recurrent expenditures. The investment mobilized from the government, NMB, EU and FAO will be new capital investments. The co-finance listed as investment mobilized has been identified through various consultations and is being considered from the following sources:

- Government of Tanzania: Agricultural Sector Development Programme Phase II (ASDP II) & Water Sector Development Program (WSDP)
- NMB Foundation: Empowering young entrepreneurs through commercial agriculture in Tanzania
- EU: Beekeeping value chain support by European Union (EU)
- FAO: The FAO investment mobilized is expected to grant received from be its regional and HQ resources for targeted new technical cooperation programme related to this project and new donor funding

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, the proposed GEF financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines. LDCF allocation is sought to be used. USD10 million is currently available for DRC from the LDCF in GEF-7.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, the PPG requested (USD 150,000 and 14,250 for Agency Fee, totaling of USD 164,250) is within the allowable cap for a Full-sized project up to USD 6 million.

Agency Response

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes. However, please consider options to increase the scale of impact indicated in the core indicators, particularly with regards to total number of land under climate resilient management and total number of direct beneficiaries.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Duly noted. The numbers (27,000 ha of land under resilient management and 82,000 direct beneficiaries) have been adjusted in the CCA Core Indicator spreadsheet.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please upload table G onto the roadmap section of the portal.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Table G has been uploaded.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

The project includes a good description of the climate trends and impacts, as well as the roots causes and barriers.

However, this description would be further strengthened in the PIF and subsequent project preparation stage with PPG support by providing further climate science information (using best available information, drawing from global, as well as national datasets to the extent they exist) about the increasing climate hazards, as well as their impacts and risks on food production, food security, and livelihoods.

Please also expand on the barrier of access to finance and insurance. E.g. What is the root cause of this barrier? How does this barrier differ by scale of farmer or by type of enterprise. Is it the same for farmers as for post harvest storage or transportation enterprises? Is the barrier as significant for micro, small scale or medium scale farmers and other enterprises? Is the limited access to microfinance a feature of lack of microfinance institutions active in the rural areas investing in small scale farmers, or is it due to unfavourable lending terms provided by microfinance institutions? Is the barrier greater for access to finance or insurance? This deeper analysis will be important for targeting solutions for greatest impact. Additionally, please separate the barriers related to post-harvest loss and lack of access to finance, given the importance and complexity of each of these types of barriers.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared. Please note that during the PPG stage, with regards to barrier 3 "Insufficient access to finance and an unfavourable investment climate", it will be important to expand on how this project can best overcome this barrier, including for example (but not limited to) consideration of providing a guarantee or other form of incentive to microfinance or other lenders operating in target rural areas to enable them to improve rates and other terms to access credit; strengthening financial literacy of target vulnerable populations, etc.

Agency Response

Well noted. During PPG, the project will ensure that the best available information will be used as basis to assess climate impacts, risks and vulnerability.

As per the recommendation, the barriers related to finance and post-harvest losses have been separated in the revised PIF - please refer to the highlighted paragraphs on page 10-11.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, the baseline scenario and associated projects are appropriately described.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

The BAU and Adaption scenarios indicated in the PIF are clear. However, please strengthen the adaptation scenario particularly for component 3 to apply market approaches for building resilience, including through greater access to finance and other financial products such as micro-insurance. Please consider opportunities to work with national finance institutions, commercial banks and microfinance institutions to finance a set of adaptation actions for climate resilient agricultural production actions. This could include, for example, the creation of line(s) of credit for climate resilience, new adaptation oriented loan products by micro-finance institutions; and/or creation of a green bond to finance conversion to climate resilient agriculture practices, etc.

With regards to component 4 please include finance and innovative financing instruments for climate resilient agriculture within the scope of the monitoring, evaluation and knowledge sharing, both within Tanzania and internationally.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Well noted. The suggested comments have been been further elaborated and integrated into the revised PIF, please refer to section 3, page 15-18 (all revisions are highlighted in yellow).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, it is aligned with the LDCF Climate Change Adaptation Focal Area.

Agency Response

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

The reasoning is described. Please strengthen by explaining how the project will increase capital and other forms of finance for small and medium scale farmers and associated enterprises to make investment in climate adaptation and resilience technologies, beyond BAU.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Additional clarification is provided in the revised PIF - please refer to the highlighted part on page 19.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

As indicated in section 1, question 6, please consider opportunities to increase the scale of impact indicated in the core indicators, particularly with regards to total number of land under climate resilient management and total number of direct beneficiaries. Please consider if expanding the project focal areas is a viable approach, for at least some of the outcomes and outputs to reach a broader within Tanzania.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Duly noted. The numbers have been adjusted and the project is now targeting 27,000 ha of land to be under resilient management as well 82,000 direct beneficiaries - the numbers have been revised in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please provide an indication of the type of technologies that will be piloted, deployed and commercialized, and the climate impacts they will focus on addressing. In doing so, please outline the criteria that will be used to prioritise technology options, based on a set of criteria regarding anticipated adaptation and resilience impact, cost-effectiveness, sustainability to maintain, co-benefits for employment or otherwise, etc.

As indicated in other sections, the entrepreneurship incubation, technology commercialisation, and adaptation financing aspects will have to be significantly strengthened to ensure innovation and the market drive approach referenced elsewhere in the PIF, as well as potential for sustainability and scaling up of the project investment. Please also consider potential for certification as a strategy for innovation and sustainability.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you for raising this point and the project intends to establish criteria for technology prioritization during the PPG phase, possibly building on the TNA approach.

The above-mentioned suggestions have been addressed in the revised PIF, please refer to section 7, page 20-21.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please include information about the proposed future engagements.

Please also expand on consultations undertaken or planned with national or regional financial institutions, commercial banks, micro-finance institutions, and insurance providers.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

GEFSEC 5Nov2019 (PPO)

The stakeholder engagement section of the PIF is somewhat general. Please indicate in more detail (list) the stakeholders that will be engaged in the project (i.e. CSOs) and describe their roles and means of engagement. Only the private sector section is currently described in detail.

GEFSEC 6Nov2019 (JS):

Cleared. Thank you for having uploaded the document with new text highlighted in green, as this enables efficient new reviews.

Agency Response

This is now reflected in the revised PIF - please refer to page 23. Please also note that several consultations have been undertaken with NMB Foundation. Further to that, series of consultations with national and regional financial institutions will be conducted during the PPG stage.

As requested, additional clarification has been provided on stakeholder engagement has been provided in the revised PIF. Please refer to the sections highlighted in green in the revised PIF attached in the roadmap section,

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please also include brief description with regards to gender considerations in accessing credit and other forms of finance and insurance for adaptation and resilience.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response This is now reflected in the revised PIF - please refer to page 23.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

This section of the PIF indicated that "adaptive capacities of local private sector... is the foundation of the project", it is important to expand throughout the PIF on how entrepreneurship and access to finance will be ensured, as well as how SMEs will be supported in commercializing new adaptation technologies they aim to introduce to the market. As also indicated in other sections, increased focus is required on engaging with commercial financial institutions in developing loan, insurance and other financial products for SMEs to invest in climate adaptation and resilience.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Well noted and this suggestion is now reflected in the revised PIF - please refer to page 23.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please consider the risk of climate vulnerability information generated through this project not being used by relevant stakeholders and public and private decision makers.

Please strengthen considerations of risk and risk mitigation measures related to the financial sustainability of investments in climate resilient agricultural practices when the project ends.

Please also consider the risk of capital available to commercialise and scale up promising technology solutions.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response

Well noted and the risk table has now been expanded to reflect the suggested considerations - please refer to page 25 of the revised PIF .

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

We welcome the intention of VPO being the main executing partner, and other executing partners being the Tanzania Forest Service Agency and others.

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. A technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement. As such, please extensively explore all possibilities for FAO not having to provide an execution support of some target technical assistance under this project.

Please also ensure complementarity with all relevant GCF Projects (of which there are 3 currently approved); Readiness support (of which there is 1); and 3 project Concepts under consideration (of which there are currently 3), all of which can be viewed here: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/countries/tanzania>

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response

Duly noted. The intention is that VPO and TFS will co-execute the entire project grant. However, please note that, in line with provisions of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards, FAO will have to assess their capacities to execute before any transfer of funds. Alternatively, third non FAO parties will be duly considered. In any case, GEF SEC will be consulted early on in the PPG process for recommendations on the best execution arrangements.

The requested revisions related to GEF-GCF coordination have been made in the PIF - please see page 26.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes. Please also reference relevance to the NBSAP.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response

The project's alignment with Tanzania's NBSAP has been included in the revised PIF, page 29.

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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Yes, please ensure ways to systematically learn from and sharing learning with other countries and relevant projects. As part of this, please consider the learning from other successful projects in catalyzing private finance for climate resilience of small scale farmers and other SMEs in the agriculture sector.

(e.g. <http://unepmeba.org/en/>; <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/business/article/2001344371/kenya-s-first-green-bond-issue-raises-sh4-3-billion>).

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response Well noted and this is now reflected in the revised PIF, page 29.

Part 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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

While an Endorsement letter is provided, Tanzania does not currently have an Operational Focal Points indicated in the GEF data base (see here: https://www.thegef.org/focal_points_list/T). The Endorsement Letter is signed by an individual other than the Political Focal Point who is indicated in the GEF data base.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Cleared.

Agency Response An endorsement letter signed by the newly appointed OFP has been uploaded in the roadmap section.
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

GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

Please address the comments indicated above in a resubmitted PIF, for further consideration for technical clearance.

GEFSEC 1Nov2019 (Jason):

Yes

GEFSEC 5Nov2019 (Jason):

Please note 3 detailed comments which require addressing and resubmit to enable technical clearance (i. include original submission date; ii. clarify co-finance category for 2 items; iii. detail on stakeholder engagement).

GEFSEC 15April2020:

On Environment and Social Safeguards: Section 5 of the PIF show that climate related risks screening has taken place, but the PIF does not elaborate on any other preliminary ESS potential risks and impacts. As such, please provide the completed FAO's Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist, or FAO's "Project Risk Certification", with explanation of risk screening. Please either attach that review note (as a document upload) and/or indicate more clearly (in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards) the indicative information regarding any Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project or program; and any measures to address such risks and impacts.

GEFSEC 15April2020:

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance. We note the resubmitted version with FAO's ESS Project Certification Form added as a new attachment, as well as additional explanatory text in section 5 on risk screening responding to the comment above.

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		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval