

# Achieving land degradation neutrality targets through restoration and sustainable management of degraded land in Northern Jordan

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10528

**Countries**

Jordan

**Project Name**

Achieving land degradation neutrality targets through restoration and sustainable management of degraded land in Northern Jordan

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/14/2020

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

The project is not aligned with the Biodiversity (BD) focal area strategy and particularly in reference to BD1-1 (*Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors,*) . If the project is presented as an MFA, there is currently very little reference to BD objectives in the context, barriers, components, baseline, stakeholders, etc. As presented, this is a SLM stand-alone and should consider aligning it as such in Table A. Please see additional comments below under Question 2 and Part II Project Justification- Question 3.

-We also recommend, the inclusion of Objective LD 2-5 given the capacity building that is required for SLM and in line with LDN.

-As restoration activities are planned, we expect the selection of '1' for the CCM Rio Marker and this would require the inclusion of expected direct and indirect the CO2 emissions avoided in the Core indicator table.

4/11/2020:

We note the revisions to the project. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Thank you for the comment. The PIF has been amended and realigned to the LD programming directions. To this end, Jordan calls upon the flexibility mechanism to use the BD STAR allocation to deliver LDN benefits.

As a result, the project is now fully aligned to programmes 1-1 and 2-5 of the LD programming directions. The necessary amendments have been made in the PIF.

The Rio Marker has been corrected, and estimates for the carbon benefits calculated using EX-ACT.

4/14/2020

Acknowledged.

### **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

3/24/2020:

Not fully. Please address the following questions/queries:

- We note the selection of BD 1-1 for \$1M, if the project is presented as an MFA, the Outputs/Activities as written are not aligned with this BD focal area Objective and it is not clear what are the global environment benefits for biodiversity. Please refer to the Programming Directions for GEF 7 (Pg 16-17) for guidance on this specific BD objective and on mainstreaming of BD in productive sectors.
- The project should also address DLDD issues, in particular drought and explore potential inclusion of the UNCCD recommended "drought-smart SLM activities" (see SPI publication).

### Component 1

-\$1,000,000 for training does not demonstrate incremental cost reasoning and added value of GEF investment. The PIF mentions additional challenges with the policy enabling environment. How is the project addressing, policy reform, land use planning, updating of strategies, improved capacities for developing the baseline, data collection and monitoring mechanisms for land degradation and LDN? How is the project incorporating the mainstreaming of BD whether through spatial and land use planning, piloting of financial mechanisms, enhancing policy and regulatory frameworks?

- Under Output 1.1.1 what are the new technologies that the governates will be trained to use?
- Are there plans to engage additional stakeholders such as farmers groups who would also need to be trained?
- Output 1.1.2- Is this output being funded by GEF financing? We suggest that this is covered by co-financing.
- How will the training be institutionalized to ensure continuity ?
- Output 1.1.4- Please include the number of targeted hectares

### Component 2

-How many small farmers will be direct beneficiaries of these interventions and what is the expected estimated improvement in income?

-The total number of hectares here (85,000ha) does not align with what is in the Core indicator table, the target hectares mentioned in the Alternative Scenario or the GEBs sections. Please adjust.

-What restoration interventions will take place on the various landscape types outlined in the Core Indicator table?

- (In reference to the core indicator table) Please indicate which outputs are targeting the different types of landscapes (hectares) for restoration and which outputs are targeting landscapes for improved practices, ensuring not to double count the targets.

### Component 3

-We acknowledge the comprehensive KM interventions; however, we also expect this component to cover monitoring and evaluation activities for the entire project.

-Output 3.1.2 should ideally be under component 1 as it covers the enabling environment.

4/11/2020:

- Please check the GEBs as they do not align with the Core Indicator Table.

- Please revise the project to make it more specific and include the target regions. It is not clear what 'primis' are.

4/14/2020:

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

- As suggested upfront, the project has been realigned and is no longer to be considered a MFA project.

- As suggested, DLDD has been integrated in the updated PIF.

- Please, consider the major amendments that have been made in the results matrix and GEF alternative scenario, due to the re-alignment process to the GEF 7 programming directions. The amendments consider all the observations made above.

4/14/2020

-Core Indicators: Please, consider the amendments made in the CI section.

-More specific language on target regions: A generic description of the bio-geographical zones where the Northern Governorates Ajloun, Irbid and Mafraq are located had been included in the PIF. The selection of the landscapes for demonstration activities in component 2 will adopt an approach that is aligned with the LDN national process. The target landscapes will be selected based on the LDN hierarchy of responses to avoid>reduce>reverse land degradation in accordance with the identified land degradation and LDN hot spots and bright spots (to be identified under C1). Other general criteria for landscape selection may be considered during the PPG:

- Existence of multiple typical problems regarding land management in Jordan, such as land degradation due to natural conditions (wind or water erosion) and unsustainable use, complexity of terrain and geographic features, types of soil layers, patterns of the local agricultural activities and lack of regulatory mechanisms leading to land degradation;
- The importance of the livestock sector to the Governorates livelihoods (GDP share and share of the population employed), with the focus on goat and sheep;
- The importance of the value chains (vegetables, olives, figs and grapes) in the landscapes of the Governorates for income generation (GDP share and share of the population employed);
- Land degradation severity and hot spots from the LD assessment under C1; and
- CC risk screening and resilience proofing of the proposed landscapes
- Complementarities with other relevant on-going projects.

- *In primis*: The choice of the wording reflects the fact that the project will be operating at different levels, i.e. national, regional (governorate), and landscape. Reference to the Northern Governorates and the landscapes had not been included in the objective statement, as the project will deliver considerable benefits at the national level as well as addressing the LDN principle to align the sub-national work to the national LDN targets

The LDN targets have been referenced at the objective level, as Jordan has gone through the target setting exercise. However, 4 out of 5 targets are referenced, and further consultations with a cohort of stakeholders are needed in order to further focus the project interventions. These consultations will be undertaken during the PPG phase.

However, the objective statement has been revised to explicitly include LDN-TSP targets and target Governorates.

#### **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-IFAD is a GEF agency, not a donor.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

4/16/2020:

After further review, we acknowledge that an error was made on our part in the classification of IFAD. Please return the classification to 'Donor Agency'.

6/17/2020:

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/17/2020

The change has been made as suggested.

4/11/2020

This comment has been addressed directly in the PIF.

### **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**

3/26/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Yes.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 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**

3/26/2020:

Yes

## **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully

-Please include the direct and indirect CO2 emissions

-Please clarify how the number of direct beneficiaries were derived.

-Please ensure the total number of hectares mentioned here align with the hectares in Table B.

4/11/2020:

Not fully.

There are figures for Sub-indicators 4.1, 4.3, 4.2 which are not referred to in other sections of the PIF. Please check alignment of GEBs in this section as well as in the section on GEBs, Table B and the Alternative Scenario.

4/14/2020:

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

All comments have addressed.

4/14/2020

Apologies, this was an oversight. It has been corrected in the CI section.

**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**

3/26/2020:

Yes

**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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully

- Please include additional information on the physical and policy context in relation to Biodiversity such as KBAs, areas with HCVF, protected areas and threats to key protected areas and species which have been caused by unsustainable agriculture and have the potential to become more degraded.

-Key barriers which have been outlined have not been addressed by the project and can erode the sustainability of the results. These include *Weak territorial governance for sustainable land use management; land tenure issues; lack of incentives; deficient partnership collaboration...* Please clarify and/or indicate if there is parallel financing that will be addressing these barriers.

4/11/2020:

During the PPG stage, please include an analysis on the challenges with the targeted value chains and their connection to achieving LDN, as well as the baseline scenario.

### **Agency Response**

Please, consider the re-alignment of the project, and therefore also the description of the project justification.

4/14/2020

Acknowledged. The analyses will be carried out during the PPG phase.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

- The description of the key regions in the baseline section do not present or analyze any biodiversity information. This will be needed in order to justify the alignment with the BD focal area.

4/11/2020:

As above during the PPG stage please include additional information on the baseline scenario related to value chain development for the targeted products.

## Agency Response

Please, consider the fact that the BD alignment has been eliminated from the proposal.

4/14/2020

Acknowledged. A comprehensive description of the baseline scenario will be developed during PPG.

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/26/2020:

Not fully

In addition to comments outlined under the **Indicative project/program description summary Question 2**, please see additional queries below:

-The project objective as written is quite limited and does not appear to reflect the full scope of the project including the location. We would suggest to utilize similar wording as the development objective.

-The project mentions a focus on two focal area indicators however these are not indicators for the LD focal area, they are Objectives. The indicators aligned with the LD focal area are mainly Indicators 3 & 4 listed in the Core indicator Table. Please correct.

-Additionally, if Jordan seeks to focus on Objective 2.5 *Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN*, (and we also recommend this inclusion), this Objective should then be listed in Table A with the requisite funding allocation.

-In relation to the point made in Questions 3, GEF defines biodiversity mainstreaming as: *“the process of embedding biodiversity considerations into policies, strategies and practices of key public and private actors that impact or rely on biodiversity, so that it is conserved and sustainably used both locally and globally.”*

This has not been reflected adequately in this section of the PIF. If the project is to be presented as a MFA, please adjust.

-Please include a brief Theory of Change, to show the transition from the current business as usual scenario to a context of SLM with biodiversity considerations on the basis of the LDN response hierarchy of avoid, reduce and restore. This can be further expanded during the PPG stage. The Checklist for LDN Transformative Projects and Programs can be used as a guide for developing the LDN elements of the project.

-There are no gender considerations or indication of private sector engagement in this section Please address/clarify.

#### Component 1

- The text here makes reference to aspects of the enabling environment, which are not reflected in Table B. Reference is made in the text stating that *The project will strengthen and enable the territorial governance framework for sustainable land management (SLM) through land use planning with increased focus on land degradation neutrality (LDN) and sustainable production areas, strengthening rules and regulations and the institutional capacity of the central and regional governments for planning, monitoring, technical assistance to small-holders and supervision.* Please ensure alignment of information between different sections of the PIF.

- How will the project address the need to determine baseline data for degraded areas and subsequent monitoring of improvements in the landscape and ensure the data is maintained?

- How are the activities in this component going to facilitate the potential for scaling and replication to other areas in Jordan.

#### Component 2

- We recommend reinforced and strengthened engagement with local farmers cooperatives in terms of training for new approaches

- Please provide additional information on the number of small farmers that will be targeted for the field based interventions.

- Are there any considerations to address issues related to the access to finance by small farmers in order to implement and sustain these new approaches.

- How will the project address the presence of refugees engaged in livestock management in the landscape (as outlined in the context)?

#### Component 3

- The PIF makes mention of challenges with a lack general public awareness on the importance of the environment. How is the project addressing this?

- How will the KM aspects facilitate upscaling and replication of the interventions to other regions within Jordan?

4/11/2020:

Yes.

During PPG:

-we expect a more fully developed ToC.

- please consider including farmers cooperatives and/or other associations that may support farmers. (Output 1.3.2 & 2.1.2)

-further information on how the training and value chain development support will be institutionalized for enduring results/impact (Component 1& 2)

-further information on how the project will address or work around the barrier related to territorial governance. This is particularly important for the results of Component 1. The barrier specifically states '*Territorial governance is also limited by the lack of coordination and efficient mechanisms for cooperation between national and regional level (governorates), as well as between the governorates and the local and private sector stakeholders*'.

-additional information on mechanisms for sustained access to finance for small farmers to continue the SLM approaches and value chain development (at the production level) after the project has ended.

### **Agency Response**

All concerns expressed above have led to considerable adjustments to the original PIF. Please, consider the updates.

4/14/2020

Thank you for the valuable inputs. The Agency commits itself to providing exhaustive details on the above mentioned elements (TOC, role of producer organisations or other forms of organisation of agricultural producers, value chain development, territorial governance related barriers, access to finance) in the CEO endorsement request.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

In this section please only indicate the specific Focal Area Objectives that the project is aligning with, as indicated in Table A. Also note that Objective 3.4: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape is actually Objective 1.4 under the GEF 7 Programming Directions for Guidance.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** The comment has been addressed.

**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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

Please see comments above under Part I, Question 1 and Part II Question 3.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Please, consider earlier responses.

**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**

3/26/2020:

Yes however, please ensure the targets are aligned with other sections of the PIF.

4/11/2020:

Please check alignment of GEBs in this section as well as in the Core Indicator Sheet, Table B and the Alternative Scenario.

### **Agency Response**

The GEBs have been revisited.

4/14/2020

The inconsistency in the CI section of the Portal has been addressed.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

Please see comments above on scale and replicability.

Sustainability- How will the training on the SLM/LDN approach be institutionalized? What are the plans to ensure the maintenance of monitoring mechanisms for tracking of the results of SLM and restoration of degraded land?

The geo-reference of the project has been included in Annex A.

4/11/2020:

The discussion on sustainability is limited. It is not clear how the points above have been addressed.

4/14/2020:

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

New language has been provided in the PIF.

4/14/2020

Additional language has been added in the PIF.

### **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**

### **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-Given the focus on BD Objective 1-1, we note that there is no mention of engagement with stakeholders who work with this mandate. Please clarify.

-Please ensure the relevant stakeholders are also referenced in the Alternative Scenario above.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

4/16/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat we ask that you please provide a description of the consultations that took place during the project identification phase, as stated in the PIF (i.e. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations; and Private Sector Entities). Note: The Policy on Stakeholder Engagement, requires that at PIF stage : ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’.

4/17/2020:

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/17/2020

A description has been inserted in the relevant section of the PIF.

4/11/2020

Please, note that the project is aligned to LD 1-1 and LD 2-5, and no longer to BD 1-1.

Key stakeholders have been referenced where relevant.

### **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-The context as described is very general, please include some project specific context and how this could lead to challenges/opportunities in the project.

-At the PPG stage we expect further Gender Analysis and gender specific targets.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

- The language has been amended to address the concern.

- The agency ensures a gender analysis will be conducted, guiding the detailed project design and fully embedding gender mainstreaming throughout the project components and the project intervention logic.

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-Please provide some information on the types of the private sector in the target regions as well as how they will be engaged?

-Please ensure the information on private sector engagement is reflected in other sections of the PIF in particular the Alternative Scenario.

4/11/2020

Noted. During the PPG, as mentioned under Part 1, Question 3- Please also consider the role of other private sector stakeholders in terms of provision of finance for the small farmers.

### **Agency Response**

Please, know that the private sector is understood as family-farmers. These direct beneficiaries from the project will also engage directly in project execution, will benefit from trainings, from value chain development efforts, and will contribute as co-financiers to the achievement of project objectives. These different dimensions have been mentioned in the updated PIF.

4/14/2020

Acknowledged by the Agency. Some amendments have been made to the private sector section of the PIF.

### **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-The overall risk rating of Low does not align with the risk ratings outlined in the PIF document. Please clarify.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

4/16/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, we note that there are some socio-political and socio-economic risks identified which may affect the project. However we note the absence of any potential social risks or impacts that may be caused by the project. The Project Risk Certification identifies this project as LOW risk, however please consider exploring potential impacts for local traditional small scale farmers in the project area for example.

We ask that you attach the Environmental and Social Risk Identification-Screening Checklist and/or indicate more clearly, in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, indicative information regarding any Social Risks and potential impacts associated with the proposed project and, if applicable, any measures to address such risks and impacts during PPG.

4/17/2020:

Thank you providing this information. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/17/2020

Please, consider the amended language in the PIF in the risks section. Furthermore, a 'ESS explained' document has been uploaded in the Roadmap Section explaining the risk screening process FAO adopts.

4/11/2020

Please, consider the ratings to the projects, as opposed to the risks from the project. For this latter, a ESS certification (LOW) has been added in the Roadmap section. In addition, climate risks have been screened, and are believe to be substantial. Also this screening is available in the Roadmap section.

#### **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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

-We note the institutional arrangements have been outlined, however we note the absence of coordination with other relevant Ministries that may be responsible for Forests and/Biodiversity.

-Please provide brief details on how the project will coordinate with the existing GEF projects as well as initiatives financed by other donors. Note that the details provided in the Baseline will need to be included here.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Please, consider the amendments to the project overall, and therefore also on the institutional arrangements.  
**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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

Please indicate what BD related strategies or national plans are in place.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Please, note that the country has full flexibility on the use of its STAR, and the BD allocation will be used to deliver LD GEBs. Therefore, BD benefits are considered important co-benefits of this project.

**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**

3/26/2020:

Not fully.

We note that the project has provided an indicative KM approach, however please provide details on how the project will incorporate learning, knowledge products, assessment, studies etc from previous or existing projects GEF and other donor funded projects.

4/11/2020:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Amendments have been made in the KM section.

**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**

3/26/2020:

Yes. However if the project is revised to reflect an stand-alone LD project, the LOE would need to be revised, to indicate the utilization of the flexibility option for the LD focal area.

4/11/2020

Updated LOE will need to be submitted prior to project clearance.

4/14/2020:

Cleared. New LOE not necessary.

**Agency Response**

4/14/2020

After further consultation with the GEFSEC, it appears further action is not required. The included LOE is sufficient.

**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**

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**

3/27/2020:

The project is not recommended for clearance at this time. Please address the comments above.

4/11/2020:

The project is not recommended for clearance at this time. Please address the comments above on Sustainability, Core Indicators and GEBs and a revised LOE.

4/14/2020:

The PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

4/16/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please address the comments above on the Co-financing table, Stakeholder Engagement and Risks, prior to clearance.

4/17/2020:

The comments/questions have been adequately addressed for the PIF stage. The PIF and PPG are 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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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