



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5735		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Effectively Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Government Policy and Private Sector Practice Piloting Sustainability Models to Take the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to Scale		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$9,800,000
Co-financing:	\$84,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$94,500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	<p>This is a global project, with a pilot initiatives in Cerrado, Afro-Montane and Indo-Burma Hotspots. GEF funding should be invested only to countries that are eligible for GEF funding and endorsement should be obtained from GEF OFP before investment. However, this practice of CEPF is not noted in the PIF and needs to be clarified. Please provide necessary information and description in the revised PIF.</p> <p>19 March 2014 Adequate response has been provided in the response sheet. Please incorporate</p>	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this information under section B.1. instead of description on innocation, as the key function of the endorsement letter is to confirm strategic fit of the project with key national strategy and plans. Please revise the PIF.</p> <p>26 march 2014 Adequately revised.</p>	
	<p>2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?</p>	<p>As noted above, OFP endorsement should be obtained before regional/country level investment will be made. Please clarify in the text.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Adequately noted in revised PIF.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	Yes, the project is requesting finance under BD set-aside finance.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>Please revise the total project budget to \$10 million (including both GEF amount and Agency fee) to be financed under the BD set-aside finance.</p> <p>19 March 2014 After some clarification, original requested amount of GEF grant \$9.8m is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		fine and within the available resources.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The project could be aligned with both BD1 and BD2 with further explanation on the linkage to the GEF strategies:</p> <p>1) Considering the project's main focus on mainstreaming biodiversity (BD2), larger GEF amount should be linked to BD2 under table A. There is no specific information provided on its linkage to the management of protected area systems (BD1).</p> <p>2) On both BD1 and BD2, there should be further explanation on "how" the project contributes to these BD GEF-5 objectives. Please provide necessary information under section B.2 of the PIF. The current two paragraphs under this section is not relevant and should be deleted, besides the first sentence. If the project will be contributing to BD1, there should be concrete outcomes and outputs related to PA management, and incorporated in both table B and the relevant text sections of the PIF.</p> <p>Appropriate linkage with the Aichi targets have been identified.</p> <p>19 March 2014</p> <p>While the resource allocation has been revised, it is still unclear how the BD1 linkage is to be achieved through the current project framework. If a PA target to be achieved, clearly incorporate appropriate indicator and target in the project framework, project description</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and project component sections.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Additional information has been provided, however, the PM suggests further revision based on following comments:</p> <p>1) Linkage on BD2 should be the main focus. Move B.2.2 before B.2.1. and clarify and stress its key linkage to BD2.</p> <p>2) On linkage to BD1, the new management models for PA should be included as key output under component 3 (not as target) in Table B and include clear description under the text in page 14-15. It is still rather unclear how this activity fits with the overall project approach on mainstreaming biodiversity through government policy and private sector. Please further clarify the linkages.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>CEPF's approach is consistent with the CBD and its strategy and targets.</p> <p>However, the text under section B.1 that explains this linkage is confusing and requires revision based on the following comments:</p> <p>1) Paragraph c on CCD should be deleted as this is a BD financed project.</p> <p>2) Section B.1.2. could explain project's fit to relevant countries' NBSAP and other biodiversity related policies and strategies as this project is financed under the GEF biodiversity focal area (note:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reference to NAPs, SRAPs, are confusing). While the descriptions of specific countries are helpful, make it short and concise with few sentences focusing on the project's link to NBSAP and key policies.</p> <p>19 March 2014 Adequately revised.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>No, section related to global environmental problems and baseline projects requires substantial revision based on the following comments:</p> <p>1) In general, please try to describe the issues in a concise fashion with a focused approach.</p> <p>2) The PM suggests to cover the following elements, and provide relevant information in no more than a paragraph for each element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global crisis on biodiversity loss. - Need for transformative, scaled up, and multi-sectoral mainstreaming approach by addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss. - History and experience of CEPF in addressing these issues. - Need for further scale up and strengthening partnership among CSOs, government and private sector, building on relevant baseline work ongoing in the hotspots. - Fact that the GEF phase 2 finance is ending, and the role of this project to bridge and pilot initiatives that could be scaled up under phase 3. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- Long term vision, particularly the business/financial plan of CEPF for phase 3 and beyond.</p> <p>3) The specific hotspots description (page 12-16) could be modified and moved as an annex of the PIF. These descriptions could be focused on the biodiversity challenges, baseline initiatives to address these challenges, and existing gaps. There is no need to list all the related conservation projects, but only note key initiatives that the project would build on.</p> <p>19 March 2014 This section has improved significantly by addressing most of the comments noted above. However, the following issues are still unclear and please clarify:</p> <p>1) Describe results of the program evaluations and highlight key recommendations and achievements, and needs for further investment through the CEPF.</p> <p>2) Further clarify the selection criteria of the three areas, highlighting the global biodiversity significance as one of the key criteria.</p> <p>3) Clarify key production sectors and development issues that the project will be addressing through each of the three pilot areas.</p> <p>4) Provide some concrete examples on some of the successful model that the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project will build on for policy and private sector partnerships.</p> <p>5) On some specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A.1.1.4: the % of GEF investment towards overall conservation investment does not seem to be correct (22% of \$21m annually?). - A.1.2.2: is civil society envisioned to be a "equal" partner or more of a "catalytic" partner to further influence public and private entities, and their policies and practices? - Include subheadings for section A (e.g. Cerrado Hotspot, Indo-Burma Hotspot, etc) for readability. - A.1.3.10 and other relevant sections on government policies: provide further information on the key sector or development policies that the project is intended to influence. Same should be clarified for private sector involvement. What industries are the project intended to work more closely and influence their practices? Please provide some brief information. - A.1.4.2. and A.1.4.3 are repetition of same information. Delete. <p>26 March 2014</p> <p>Most of the comments have been addressed but some points are described insufficiently or not addressed. Please further address the following points:</p> <p>1) On project evaluation, please inform further on the evaluations that have been conducted during the project period,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>including the GEF project's mid-term review conducted by the Bank and their positive reviews. Further, please note that the project will take in consideration the results of the terminal evaluation/ICR which will be conducted at the completion of phase 2 at end of 2014.</p> <p>2) The GEF investment on conservation is not accurate (i.e. it is not 22% of \$21 billion annually). Please delete this information.</p> <p>3) On baseline activities of each hotspot, the complementarity of the existing GEF investment and CEPF activities is not clear. The large investments made already in these hotspots make us question the need for further funding. Information under the "baseline" and "key initiatives that CEPF will build on" (e.g. A.1.2.6 and A.1.2.8) may better be merged and revised into one section for further clarity.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>No, table B is complex and rather confusing. Please make substantial revision to the table by addressing the following comments:</p> <p>1) General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project framework is too long, and needs to be shortened and focused within 2-3 pages. - Remove all reference to timing (e.g. Q2Y1), and tighten the description. Most of the component, outcome and output descriptions could use the first sentence upto the comma or semicolon, and 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>remove the rest. Project description (section A in the text) could be used instead to explain the details on project approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expected outcomes, outputs, and indicators are often mixed up and require revision. - Many of the identified targets are very ambitious and could be reviewed to ensure feasibility. <p>2) Components:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 1.1. needs to be revised and inform results, led by the identified outputs. It could inform about: the sustained conservation operation in the selected hotspots. The associated indicators require to include expected target numbers at this stage (note: this could be revised based on assessment at the CEO endorsement). - Outcome 1.1.3. "Public policy" is a very generla term, and requires further clarification, e.g. key production sector policies, land use plan, national development plan, etc. <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 2.1 and 2.2 should be revised and inform about the "increased capacity of the CSOs" and "increased financial resources....," which are to be measured by relevant indicators. Indicators under 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this component also requires expected target. The capacity development scorecard could be used as an effective indicator and noted in this section with a target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 2.1.1., 2.1.2., and 2.2.1. needs to be revised and stated as output (i.e. number of CSO platforms, number of trainings on specific topics, and number of RM strategy, etc). - Output 2.1.3., and 2.2.2, are indicators for outcome 2 and should be moved to the relevant section. <p>Component 3:</p> <p>Outcomes of this component could be consolidated and replaced with the current outcome 3.3. Outcome 3.1 and 3.2 are outputs to achieve outcome 3.3.</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The outputs of this component could be consolidated and simplified. - Knowledge management and lessons sharing initiatives could be expanded beyond CEPF, and involve GEF and other donor partners as well as with CBD and other fora <p>3) Specific comments (to be clarified in the text section, not in table B):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the difference between the current Ecosystem Profile and the Long 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>term Conservation vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the knowledge management and products, please further clarify and consider interactive and innovative products and tools. - The term "permanent institution/mechanism" may not be appropriate considering nothing could guarantee/ensure its permanent existence. Please consider other suitable terminology. <p>19 March 2014 While the project framework and design have improved, table B is still lengthy and complex. There seems to be confusion between outputs and indicators (i.e. almost identical information provided). The PM will provide detailed explanation and suggestion in person to further streamline the project framework. Please revise based on the discussion.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Further improvement has been made. However, some of the target amounts are inconsistent and confusing. Some of the targets could better fit as outputs.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>No, the global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning needs to be further clarified and strengthened:</p> <p>Section A.3. and A.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The alternative scenario could build on the CEPF's current approach (i.e. CSO capacity development and conservation initiatives mainly protected areas and species) as business-as-usual scenario, its 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>gap and constraints, and the need for wider partnerships and institutional and financial sustainability.</p> <p>- The description on each project components could have clear heading, and description to the focused and concise.</p> <p>Section A.5.</p> <p>- The Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) should focus on biodiversity benefits. Please remove the other focal area benefits, while it could be summarized to a short paragraph noting co-benefits to other focal areas.</p> <p>- Please identify a few key and tangible GEBs that the project will be producing, and include in the description with few bullet points.</p> <p>19 March 2014 This section has improved but require further work based on the following comments:</p> <p>1) While a good set of GEBs have been identified under section A.1.5.2. these information are not found in the project framework nor project description. It is confusing how these GEBs are to be achieved. Please make sure to integrate these GEBs/targets in the project design.</p> <p>26 March 2014</p> <p>Some of the GEBs that are described in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>four bullet points under section A.1.5.2. is not consistent with the number/amount that are described in table B.</p> <p>Inconsistent descriptions on the GEBs/key project results between, for example, A.1.4.2. and A.1.5.2. are confusing. Please provide consistent, one set of information. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>No. Please clarify the "roles" of different category of stakeholders, particularly the CSOs and Indigenous Peoples, and "how" they will be engaged throughout the project cycle.</p> <p>Please also address gender issues and the project approach on gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment.</p> <p>19 March 2014 While IPs and gender issues are noted in several sections of the PIF, please clearly articulate their involvement and roles in the stakeholder section, p.17 of the PIF.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Adequate information has been provided. To be in line with the GEF gender policy, please also note in the text that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		appropriate gender analysis/assessment will be conducted during project preparation and vision development.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>Major risks have been identified, however, please further address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political space for CSO involvement in policy change could be a potential risk in number of countries. Please review and revise the rating as necessary. 2. Cofinancing has to be secured at the time of CEO endorsement so it is not appropriate to include it as a risk. If appropriate, include it as a risk for sustainable financing in general. <p>19 March 2014 On the cofinancing, is it unclear whether this section is describing the "confirmed" cofinance at the time of CEO endorsement (which needs to be confirmed with letters), or "expected" leveraged finance during project implementation. Please further clarify the description.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Further information provided.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>No. In addition to listing relevant projects, clarify "how" and "on what issues" the project will coordinate with these projects.</p> <p>19 March 2014 While useful information has been provided, many section notes about the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>"overlap" in activities with the ongoing initiatives. It is unclear whether there is an overlap or related initiatives that provide opportunities for complementarity and coordination. It maybe a terminology issue, however, please revise and provide further clarity.</p> <p>26 March 2014 The PM did not see revision based on above comment. Please address the issue.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Please have three distinct sections on innovation, sustainability, and scaling up issues under section A.6, and have concise and focused description, particularly on the innovation section.</p> <p>Innovation can be broadly categorized in two levels: 1) Innovative tools/approaches currently used by CEPF; and 2) innovative elements added under this project.</p> <p>Sustainability and scale up sections require further clarification and information, building on the project approach and activities.</p> <p>19 March 2014 Improvement has been made to streamline and clarify the key elements of innovation, scale-up and sustainability. On sustainability and scaling up, please also provide additional information on the longer term vision and business plan (i.e. how it intends to grow and/or phase out).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>26 March 2014</p> <p>Additional information has been provided. It is rather unclear how the timeline of the business plan development and this project matches (i.e. what comes first and the sequence of activities). Please clarify.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>1. Cofinancing ratio of 1 to 6 is considered adequate.</p> <p>2. Please select a source of cofinancing for the tbd cofinancier.</p> <p>3. As noted above please revise the GEF grant amount to be \$10m total (including grant and agency fee).</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>There is no cofinance identified from CI. This is an important element, particularly as a new GEF agency, and we expect substantial cofinancing from CI as a GEF Project Agency. Please review and revise.</p> <p>19 March 2014</p> <p>Considering CI's long term involvement in CEPF, and its role for this project as GEF Agency, please further clarify and ensure cofinancing by CI. Please revise</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>accordingly.</p> <p>26 March 2014 The above comment has not been fully addressed. It remains a concern that there is not even an indicative amount noted on the cofinance from CI. In addition, in line with other donors' description, it would be helpful to understand when the current CI's investment towards CEPF will end. The PM suggest to discuss the issue of CI's cofinance further, and clarify in the PIF.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>The project management cost is identified as more than 10% (table B). This is much higher than the norm of 5% and considered inappropriate. Please revise.</p> <p>19 March 2014 PMC is revised to about 5% and considered appropriate.</p>	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG of total \$200000 is requested, and considered appropriate.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No. Please address all the above comments. Please resubmit the revised PIF, along with a response matrix to the comments.</p> <p>19 March 2014 No. The GEFSEC has received a revised and improved PIF, however, please further address the comments/clarification made above, and resubmit the revised PIF.</p> <p>26 March 2014 Np. The GEFSEC has received a revised and improved PIF, however, please further address the comments made above. The PM suggests to have a meeting/teleconference to clarify some of the points to expedite the process for finalization.</p> <p>28 March 2014 Yes. The GEFSEC has received a revised PIF that adequately respond to all</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>comments made earlier. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>By CEO endorsement, in addition to all the requirements, please particularly ensure that the following issues are further clarified and detail information provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - global environment benefits are further substantiated with tangible indicators, baseline information, and targets. - provide further information on the target policies and private sector partnerships that will be pursued in the hotspots. - reflect and update based on the progress made on the development of the business plan and its content. - reflect further feedback and inputs provided by the CEPF donor partners and others. - secure cofinancing letters from partners as listed in the PIF, and continue efforts to leverage additional finance. <p>-</p>	
<p>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/</p>	<p>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	First review*	March 11, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 19, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2014	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**