



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

GEF ID:	5351		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas in Madagascar		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$113,000	Project Grant:	\$3,905,265
Co-financing:	\$45,407,409	Total Project Cost:	\$49,538,674
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari,

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 ?	4-9-13 Yes. Madagascar is eligible for funding. Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	4-9-13 Yes. There is a LoE signed by the GEF OFP for the amount of \$4,400,000. That is the amount needed to cover the project, including Agency Fees and PPG. Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	4-9-13 Yes. There is enough STAR allocation to support this project.	6-30-16 Cleared

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	4-9-13 Yes. The balance in BD STAR (\$23,312,000) is enough to cover this project (\$4,000,000). Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	4-9-13 Yes. BD-1, and Aichi Targets 5,6,11 and 14. Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared
	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?	4-3-13 The list of National Strategies, plans and reports is pretty comprehensive. Thanks. Please list only those where there is explicit reference to the "New Protected Areas" (NPAs), which are at the core of this project. Links or page numbers on these documents would be ideal but not necessary. This information would facilitate the presentation of the project to the CEO and GEF Council as appropriate. Thanks.	6-30-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>4-9-13 Thanks for providing detailed information on the baseline for the 9 NPAs. Some observations and requests: 1. Although all the 9 NPAs have a "promoter", not all have funding available as baseline. GEF SEC assumes that the amounts under "Current Annual Investments from actor" in Annex 1, are the investments/year, and will be used as co-financing. The sum of investments over the next 4 years in the 9 NPs is \$1,224,000 when adding all investments over the next 4 years. The co-financing in Table C (excluding the National Government) is far greater (\$11.3M). Please clarify the difference. 2. In the baseline at the national Level, there is only reference to the work on updating the Protected Area Code. There is no reference to the baseline investments on the activities to strengthen the National Protected Area System. But there is co-financing in the amount of \$3,000,000. Please clarify.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	<p>6-30-16 There is a detail description of the Baseline projects in Table 9 (p.38-58). Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>4-9-13 General Component 1. 1) It is not clear how the National Protected Area System will be strengthening with the proposed activities. Will training in PA management suffice for this purpose?</p> <p>Component 2. 1) It is not clear how the \$2.7m from GEF will be used in the 9 NPAs, in addition to work on obtaining definitive protected area status. One of the proposed activities is to "help develop alternative livelihoods by promoting investments in compatible socio-economic activities". Please clearly articulate what this means. What are these "alternative livelihoods"? If there were alternatives, why the local people have not taken advantage? How this project aims at securing the biodiversity conservation inside of these NPAs is the weakest part of the project. Please ellaborate on the actual activities to be carried out and HOW they relate to conservation of BD. 2) Not clear how NPAs can increase management effectiveness when all the funds allocated to the Component (GEF \$2.7M + Co-financing \$7M) are for Technical Assistance). Are there no needs for Investments in these NPAs? What is the level of protection and enforcement on these NPAs? 3) Please add the IUCN category of the NPAs in Annex 1.</p>	<p>7-1-16 No. The description of the proposed interventions under the GEF Alternative is very weak. In a 92 page document, only three pages (59-61) are used to describe the activities, outputs and outcomes. This part of project reads more like a PIF that as a CEO Endorsement. Please elaborate with emphasis on Component 1, 3 and 4. Component 1 (with nearly \$0.5 million in investments) is loaded with training and capacity building activities of unknown nature. Not clear why Component 4 is using more than 1/3 of a million dollars. The outputs suggest a much lower investment.</p> <p>The Theory of Change is welcome. Nonetheless, it is not possible to follow the chain of cause-effect relationships linking inputs-outputs-outcomes and impact. Please reformulate using similar graphics. Thanks.</p> <p>Please provide a better map for the suggested 9 NPAs. A map with the expected perimeters of the proposed NPAs should be available by now.</p> <p>10-18-16 COMPONENT 1 There is no description of the proposed activities of Output 1.1.3 (Relevant Inter-ministerial committee....). Page 62.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 3 Not sure the proposed activities can secure sustainability. What does really require for a PA to have a chance at supporting itself in the socio-economic environment of Madagascar? Please translate those needs into activities, as appropriate.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	<p>Please number the outputs correctly (i.e. 1.1.1 not 1.1 on page 61)</p> <p>Would the budgets allocated to outputs 1.1.2 (\$19K), 1.1.3 (\$13K) and 1.1.5 (\$19.5K) be sufficient to achieve the objectives of the outputs? Please merge, remove or amend outputs as necessary.</p> <p>Not clear how an investment of \$19.5K in output 1.1.5 (which appears to be the identification and implementation of M&E tools), can result in an improvement of 30% in the METT at each site (Annex A. Project Results Framework, p. 106). Increases in METT can only happen with TA and INV in the Protected Areas.</p> <p>Please format the TOC tables in Landscape Format in the CEO Endorsement. Not possible to see part of the tables because of the margins.</p> <p>Not clear if output 1.1.4 will result in the legal decrees and/or management plans for the 9 NPAs. If management plans, shouldn't they be under Component 2? See that output 3.1.3 also talks about legal instruments. Please re-organize the outputs and budgets.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>Many of the proposed activities described in Table 11 are not eligible for GEF funding. Please remove them. In addition, not clear how Biodiversity</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Conservation in these NPAs will be achieved with many of the proposed activities. Please narrow-down the activities that are relevant to BD conservation and community benefits and which are necessary to deliver GEBs.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>Output 3.1.3 is about legal Instruments. Does this belong to Component 1?</p> <p>SUM OF CO-FINANCING Please review sum of co-financing and other financials. Numbers do not add up.</p> <p>03-06-17 A little bit more detailed ToC paragraph would also have been welcome. Otherwise comments addressed. Cleared</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>4-9-13 GEBs are identified for each of the NPAs in Annex 1. Would be possible to provide a map with the location of the NPAs and a bibliographic reference where the 93 NPAs were listed?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	<p>6-30-16 Yes. List of GEBs per NPA listed in "Baseline Situation for the 9 sites" pages 23-37. Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		6-30-16 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	4-9-13 Public participation is mentioned under the Activities to be funded by the GEF (Annex 1). Do the communities inside and around the target NPAs know this project is being considered for funding? 4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared	6-30-16 While local communities are mentioned throughout the CEO Endorsement, it is not clear how the project will engage with them to provide economic benefits. Please describe proposed interventions. 10-18-16 Please refine the proposed activities to clearly show the ones that will provide economic benefit to the communities. The list of activities under Table 11 needs a serious revision. 03-06-17
	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)	4-9-13 The risks and proposed measures listed on p. 9 could apply to any project in Madagascar or other developing country. Please provide country- and NPA-specific information on the risks and mitigation measures. What is the risk that these NPAs do not get formal legal status? Once they do, what is the risk that these areas, due to their nature (IUCN IV, V and VI) end up being used by local communities unsustainably, simply because natural resources become limited Do these NPAs really have a chance at protecting biodiversity?	6-30-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>4-9-13 There is a long list of projects in Madagascar. Was there any attempt to coordinate the preparation of this PIF with any of the projects listed on p. 10.? What projects are worth coordinating with because of geographic and/or thematic overlaps?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	<p>6-30-16 Cleared</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>4-9-13 Innovation: Not much global innovation. Perhaps some innovation at the national level with the use of NPAs. Sustainability: Not clear how the sustainability of these NPAs will be secured by means of i) financial strategies, ii) implementation Decree for the new PA management code. What other activities were considered and worth mentioning again in this context? Scaling up: If successful, this project has the potential to be replicated in the other 84 NPAs.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	<p>6-30-16 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6-30-16 Detailed description of changes since PIF on pages 69-73 Cleared
	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?		6-30-16 Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4-9-13 Yes. Assuming co-financing becomes readily available during project implementation. Do the co-financiers know they have been included in this PIF with the co-financing amounts listed in Table C? Please see comment under item 6 on co-financing when summing amounts in Annex 1 and comparing ot with Table C. 4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared
	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?	4-9-13 UNEP brings \$200K in co-financing. Cleared	6-30-16 There is co-financing from The Ministry of Agriculture in the amount of \$38,000,000. Nevertheless, the Letter of Co-financing indicates that the Le PRIASO is running from 2013 to 2018. Please only include the amount corresponding to the years the project will be running (2016-2018). Please obtain a revised LoC. On Table C, the Ministry is not an NGO. It is the National Government.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>The LoC from the Foundation Liz Claiborne appears to be for is for \$80,000 per year. If this the case, please adjust value of total co-financing in Table considering the duration of the project.</p> <p>GEF funds cannot be used as a source of co-financing. Blue Ventures indicate \$100K from the GEF (2015-2016)</p> <p>10-18-16 Please provide an updated letter of cofinancing for the Ministry of agriculture indicating the new amount of \$23.75 million.</p> <p>03-06-17 The annex L with the up-dated letter of co-financing wasn't found.</p> <p>8-29-17 Cleared</p>
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4-9-13 It is 4.5 of the Total Project cost. Cleared	6-30-16 It is 5%. Cleared
	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?	4-9-13 No. Cleared	6-30-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	4-9-13 No. Cleared	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		7-1-16 The project aims at creating 9 NPAs but only 7 TTs were included in the first submission. Please add missing TTs or clarify. 10-18-16 If the two sites are NPAs they need to have the TT. If not available, remove the sites from the CEO Endorsement (May be re-considered for investment during project implementation but not formally part of the project). 03-06-17 The TT were not found in the document. 8-29-17 Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		7-1-16 Yes. Cleared
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? • The Council? 		6-30-16 As with STAP comments, please provide an answer to the comments by the GEF Council and indicate how their questions have been addressed in the CEO Endorsement as appropriate:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Comments by Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note that the PIF section on relations with national plans is well done. In particular, we welcome it highlighting the project's relation with specific Aichi Targets and indicators, and we look forward to this coverage going forward. • We note that the PIF identifies conservation as a major weakness of past Protected Areas (PA) initiatives in Madagascar "with insufficient attempts to develop sustainable utilization and participatory, co-management approaches". Given the perception that PAs are promoted by international actors, as stated in the PIF, we are concerned by the absence of domestic productive sectors as key stakeholders as well as co-financiers of the project. We request that the final proposal elaborate on this important element. • Please clarify what is meant by new Protected Areas being "sustainably" and "effectively" managed; the project's vision for the sustainable management of Protected Areas should be clear. • Please explain how the project will achieve the following statement: "An underlying aim will be to generate socio-economic benefits for local communities and other economic actors, as well as generating biodiversity conservation, at all sites". • We request that the reference to "National and local fishery and agriculture departments" on Page 9 be

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>strengthened for the final project document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request clarity on the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Is "sustainability" equated to "large-scale funding from international partners", as page 6, A.1.3 seems to suggest? ▫ Is training enough to generate "effective and sustainable management of PAs" and, if so, training in what areas? <p>Comments by France</p> <p>We globally support this proposal but we would like to underline two concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, there is the fact that the success of this project will be highly dependent on the success of the political process in the country to establish a stable government in capacity to finally review and pass the Law on the new protected areas management code (COAP) which is compulsory to legalize the whole process of creation of New Protected Areas. This new COAP was prepared toward 2008 and was never passed to the assembly because of the political crisis still on going. The current COAP from 2001 which is the legal reference at the moment is not providing legal provision to establish the NAP. The establishment of NAP is only governed by decrees and decisions with limited legal strength. The issue of passing this new COAP Law is beyond the reach of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>this project, and for this reason is a high risk for the sustainability and replicability of the investments to be made. Mitigation measures should be developed on this subject at project development stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second, the project intends to support the CSAPM (Madagascar Commission for the Protected Area System) as a national coordination body for the development of the NAPs, as well as to support 9 NPAs on the field with different NGOs who are official 'promoters' and/or delegated 'managers' of those NPAs. If the idea is very good, it gives no clear statement on how the CSAPM will be empowered to be truly in capacity to coordinate multiple 'promoters' and/or delegated 'managers' of those MPAs. We know that beyond the nice picture of multiple NGOs supporting the conservation challenges in Madagascar (which is very much welcome), there's in fact also many challenges with little coordination, different if not opposite strategies and approaches on the development and management of NPAs. In this regard, the PIF doesn't provide any activity or results indicators in the logical framework to demonstrate how the CSAPM will be in capacity to improve the coordination. Will some 'promoters' and/or delegated 'managers' of NPAs accept to adopt best practices that can be develop by other organizations? Will 'promoters' and/or delegated 'managers' of NPAs adopt harmonized biodiversity

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>monitoring system to allow the CSAPM to be in capacity to compare management efficiency of different NPAs ? etc. At development stage, the project document needs to tackle this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion: Favourable, with the above recommendations <p>Comments by Germany</p> <p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the specific risk situation, Germany recommends focussing on a selected number of (3-4) NPA sites especially in coastal zones and mangrove areas (instead of general, system-wide support). There, management effectiveness should be improved and funding be guaranteed. Only subsequently the coverage of other NPAs should be sought on the basis of lessons learned. • Cooperation with other organisations (e.g. GIZ and KfW) which have been working in Madagascar in the green sector to enhance capacity development on the national level is recommended. Important Madagascan institutions involved in NPA issues and cooperation between civil society organisations and policy makers, ministries and multi-level administration shall also be considered. • NGOs working on NAPs in

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Madagascar are partly already funded by World Bank Programmes. Although adequate and necessary financial flows shall be maintained and guaranteed, potential double funding or possible overfunding shall be avoided.</p> <p>Comments by United States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The U.S. government recognizes that Madagascar's biodiversity is an extraordinary public good, and merits protection. Therefore, for purposes of consistency with U.S. biodiversity policy, the United States does not register a formal objection to this program. This position does not indicate recognition of the de facto regime in Madagascar. <p>7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the technical aspects of this project, on Page 3, Project component 3 Expected Output 3.1 states that there will be a "Mechanism to ensure local conservation knowledge is captured and stored in a format useful for national dissemination." We recommend the final project proposal include specifics on the mechanism (or options for appropriate mechanisms) and what kinds of formats are most useful in the Madagascar context. <p>10-18-16</p> <p>COMMENTS BY CANADA B. In the response to the question of domestic productive sectors as key stake</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>holders, UNEP and partners provided as long list of sectors (under ii). Nevertheless, the names of these sectors do not correspond to the those in the list of Stakeholders (Table 10 bis. p.96). The response should list only those that are true stakeholders, that is, that will play an specific- and focus-role in the execution of the project. Please address this matter in the Response Matrix (Annex B p. 112).</p> <p>COMMENTS BY FRANCE</p> <p>B. Although there are multiple references to supporting CSAPM, there is only one investment of \$19K associated with the institution in Component 1. Please elaborate on how the project will support CSAPM and if the institution is in capacity to carry-out the proposed coordination.</p> <p>COMMENTS BY GERMANY</p> <p>a. The issue of reducing the number of NPAs for support by this project and funding per site (vs. system-wide support) is quite relevant. Please confirm that the co-financing (specially cash) will become available during project execution</p> <p>c. In order to clarify the question on double funding, provide a list of the target NPAs that are being supported by other sources of funding. If none, please clearly state it in the Response to Council Comments.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>COMMENTS BY THE US</p> <p>Please address question on the "specific of the mechanism" and what formats are most useful in the Madagascar context. The initial response in the CEO Endorsement is vague.</p> <p>03-06-17 Comments dated 10-18-16 by FRANCE and GERMANY have been addressed. regarding CANADA's point, will a one time event be enough to ensure stakeholders involvement? regarding USA's comment, the answer send back to a further coming expertise by an undetermined NGO or CSO. This is not a lot more precise. Could you please be more specific?</p> <p>8-29-17 Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>4-9-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under 5-13. Thanks.</p> <p>4-12-12 Yes. This PIF is technically cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>		
<p>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</p>	<p>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		<p>7-1-16 No. Please address issues under items 7,10, 17,21 and 23. Thanks. The GEF Secretariat would be happy to further</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>discuss this review during the upcoming ECW in Madagascar, July 26th-29th.</p> <p>10-19-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 7,10,17, 21 and 23. The Agency and Government need to work on the issues raised in this second review by taking a close reading of the entire project to make it "air-tight". The CEO Endorsement is very loose and need to be tight-up. Attention to detail is critical at this juncture. Thanks.</p> <p>03-06-17 No. Please address the remaining comments and provide the missing annexes.</p> <p>8-29-17 Cleared</p>
	First review*	April 09, 2013	July 01, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	October 19, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 06, 2017	August 19, 2017
Review Date (s)			

* **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.**