



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4769		
Country/Region:	Trinidad and Tobago		
Project Title:	Improving Forest and Protected Area Management		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$119,000	Project Grant:	\$2,790,000
Co-financing:	\$27,720,074	Total Project Cost:	\$30,629,074
PIF Approval:	April 16, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Illias Animon

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?	December 13, 2011 Yes - CBD: 1996, CCD: 2000, FCCC: 1994	March 25, 2014 As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 13, 2011 Yes, letter from OFP J Singh dated 25 November 2011 is presented. March 26, 2012 Given that the project design has changed and the resource request has changed please submit a new endorsement letter, identifying the total amount of resources requested. Also, please note that Trinidad and Tobago	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		falls under the flexibility rule and that the proposal will use the amount requested, even though it exceeds the amount allocated for the biodiversity focal area. April 5, 2012 New endorsement letter provided.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	December 13, 2011 FAO's comparative advantage in TA for BD, CC and SFM projects is clear from experience. Please elaborate a little on FAO's comparative advantage in Inv projects given approximately 20% of overall budget is Inv activities. March 26, 2012 Adequate explanation provided.	March 25, 2014 As at PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	December 13, 2011 There is no non-grant instrument.	March 25, 2014 There is no NGL.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	December 13, 2011 FAO's current projects are mainly agricultural sector based but there are links for forests and backstopping will be available from FAO's regional forestry officer in Barbados.	March 25, 2014 Aligned with Country Program Framework 2012-15.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	December 13, 2011 Yes. As at 09 December 2011 STAR allocations still to be programmed were: BD \$2,740,000; CC \$2,940,000; LD \$1,240,000.	March 25, 2014 Total requested amount remains as at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>The PIF was revised and CC and LD allocations were removed, making it solely a biodiversity project. The current request totals \$ 3.069 million with fee.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Yes, amounts are within the FA allocations. The Trinidad and Tobago STAR allocation is flexible.</p> <p>Please ensure that the request for funds from the SFM/REDD incentive is within the maximum 1:3 ratio.</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>Total Grant request is \$2,790,000 from BD.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Generally yes but please amend Table A so that each FA Objective is costed individually. Also in Table A, the text</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>Project draws wholly from BD1.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>used for outcomes and outputs should match that in the Template Reference Guide at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Please clarify under Output 1.2, the number of unprotected threatened species that will be protected with the new protected area coverage.</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>In CCM-5 restoration activities relate to FA Strategy Outcome 5.2 rather than 5.1. Please clarify what the outputs are for Outcome SFM 1.1.</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>We note that in some places the text state that cofinance will pay for restoration and rehabilitation of degraded areas and in others it states that rehabilitation of HCV forests will be paid for by GEF. Please clarify in the text that all forest restoration and forest rehabilitation will be paid for by cofinance.</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>The project is centered on BD1 Outcome 1.1 improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas and Outcome 1.2 increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>December 13, 2011 The 4th CBD report identifies the 2001 NBSAP as the key planning document for BD. The 4th CBD report also indicates the forest inventory is to be completed by early 2011, so it is unclear what remains to be done on the national forest inventory. Please explain how the initial National Communication to the UNFCCC and the second NC which is well underway has been taken into account in this project. Also, please explain how the forest carbon work links to the recent IDB project addressing climate change within policy frameworks.</p> <p>March 26, 2012 Elements related to UNFCCC and forest carbon have been deleted in the redesigned project.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014 Improved management of PAs and expansion of marine PAs have been elements of 2001 NBSAP. The project also complements the National Forest Policy and the National Protected Areas Policy both of which identify the development of the Forest and Protected Areas Management Authority and the establishment of a Forest and Protected Areas Fund</p>
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>December 13, 2011 Components 1 and 2 include CD elements however Components 3 and 5 require further description. Component identifies CD in participatory and other skills - please elaborate on what these other skills are. The process from capacity building to implementation would also need to be detailed to properly assess it. There are concerns about the means available to put CD in practice; the 2010 UNFF/Indufor report on SFM financing suggests CD gaps in more than just participatory practices.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014 The project identifies capacity building needs in order to identify conservation gaps and the PA network exacerbated by the multiple roles and fractured responsibilities among agencies. The project is a primary step in the development and initiation of the Forest and Protected Areas Management Authority. Additionally capacity will be strengthened through infrastructure improvements and the development of the finance system.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revisions and explanations provided.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. 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>December 13, 2011</p> <p>The baseline is poorly described and requires significantly more detail and quantification. It is not clear whether the proposed co-financing is new and additional funds or merely Government recurrent budget expenditure on forests. Please provide a clear description of the baseline project, including a brief description of the status of the national forest inventory, and associated investments.</p> <p>The threats to PAs, BD, forests and forest carbon are not clearly described - governance of forest areas is identified as a capacity issue but how this links to PAs and forest carbon is not evident, please explain what the key risks and drivers are.</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Although most of the revisions are adequate, assisted by the removal of the CC elements of the project design and references to forest carbon, the explanation of the FAO pipeline of projects is not sufficient. Please describe these investments and projects in more detail including their start and end dates and funding amounts.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>The baseline has been comprehensively described. There has been a long lead in period to action on the rationalization of forests and PA management. The development of the Green Fund and support from the EU provide a clear baseline investment.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		April 5, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		March 25, 2014 The project is focused on rationalizing what is a fragmented and inefficient current approach to PA management. Consolidation of management responsibilities and identification of the initial 6 PAs appears to be a cost-effective approach.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	December 13, 2011 In the absence of a clear baseline this is difficult to assess and will need to be revisited in light of full details of the baseline. However it is not clear what incremental activities the GEF investments are at this stage. March 26, 2012 We note that in some places the text state that cofinance will pay for restoration and rehabilitation of degraded areas and in others it states that rehabilitation of HCV forests will be paid for by GEF. Please clarify in the text that all forest restoration and forest rehabilitation will be paid for by cofinance. April 5, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	March 25, 2014 GEBs are secured by the identification and improved management of 6 pilot PAs which together cover 7.6 % of land mass as well as 59k ha of marine area. 500 ha of restoration is maintained in the project supported by co-finance.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	December 13, 2011 The project appears to be very much a BD/PA project onto which a CCM	March 25, 2014 The project framework is relatively simple consisting of improvements to

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>element has been attached. However the link between them and therefore the synergies expected of a SFM/REDD project are not evident - please provide details of how the project components are wholly integrated and capture opportunities from being part of the same project including what current policies support forest carbon activities.</p> <p>It is not clear what is planned within Component 5 - please provide a much more detailed breakdown of proposed activities.</p> <p>Please provide further details of the setting up of the TF. Please explain clearly what GEF resources are to be used for - further details are required on the long term funding of the TF. Additionally, explain the role of PES which is included in senior staff training but does not seem to appear elsewhere. Also explain how the recommendations of STAP on PES are addressed.</p> <p>Please explain the plans for rehabilitation in 3.1.3 and also what equipment and facilities are planned to be provided with GEF funding.</p> <p>In Table A, 500 hectares of priority areas are to be restored, but this does not appear to be reflected in table B. Please include in Table B, and include estimates of expected carbon benefits.</p>	<p>legislation and institutional arrangements for PA management including greater stakeholder involvement, PA management infrastructure improvement and the establishment of the PA management fund.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Please note that improvement of the total management effectiveness score for the 5 new PAs should be an outcome under component one.</p> <p>Many issues were clarified by removing the CC and LD funding and the SFM request.</p> <p>The PES training does not seem warranted as what is described in the text is not PES but simply better PA revenue management. We do not see this as a PES but simply improved tourism and tourism revenue management. Therefore please revise the text.</p> <p>The project framework mentions a reduction of the funding gap of \$65,000. Please clarify what is the current annual budget and what is needed and how the number of \$65,000 was decided as the target.</p> <p>Please also note in the FA framework it notes that the sustainable finance plan will cover 130,000 hectares but it is not clear if this is the entire PA system with the addition of the 35,000 hectares. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>The provided explanation was not</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>adequate.</p> <p>Please clarify the following:</p> <p>1) what is the annual budget expenditure for the protected area system.</p> <p>2) what is the "ideal" annual budget needed to manage the protected area system.</p> <p>3) what is the gap between the actual budget and the "ideal" budget for optimum management.</p> <p>4) how much of the gap will be filled by the proposed project and please justify why this target is chosen and how this gap reduction will result in sufficient resources being available to significantly improve protected area management.</p> <p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Again, this will have to be revisited with adequate baseline details.</p> <p>Please provide further details including calculations on the carbon benefits expected from Component 4 including the baseline assumptions. Similarly, what are the expected benefits resulting from the efforts to address other illegal activities. Please give further explanation of the benefits expected</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>The reasoning is founded on the move from fragmented responsibilities and authorities to a more comprehensive PA management authority with an institutional mandate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		from the rehabilitation of areas in 3.1.3. March 26, 2012 Adequate revisions provided.	
	16. 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?	December 13, 2011 There is limited coverage of socio-economic benefits - clearer description of what the project is considering is necessary given that as identified in the risks there is likely to be resistance to restrictions on unlawful forest uses. Please describe what socio-economic benefits are expected for these forest users and how changes to their activities can be supported. Gender issues are treated rather lightly - this will have to include actions other than just representation in meetings. Also, tourism is mentioned as a source of sustainable financing. If tourism is going to be promoted, please consider the risk of increasing GHGs from tourism travel if appropriate, and consider mitigation options. March 26, 2012 Adequate revisions provided.	March 25, 2014 Socio-economic benefits are likely to be modest. However the project proposes to increase community involvement and hence opportunities through participatory management approaches. Key benefits are the development of sustainable use models for currently overexploited resources. Development of NR-based sustainable livelihood opportunities are also included.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	December 13, 2011 B5 includes a range of stakeholders, however again the role of local communities that will be affected by the project appears limited to being recipients rather than part of the project including its design and implementation.	March 25, 2014 The inclusion of businesses and local communities in PA management planning is identified. Specific CSOs are identified as important for fulfilling certain outputs of the project. There is potential impact on local livelihoods due

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revisions and explanations provided.</p>	<p>to curtailing current NR use practices however the project includes provision for the development of alternative livelihood options.</p>
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>The key risks are identified. These will have to be addressed more fully at CEO Endorsement. The risk of resistance to strengthened law enforcement should be further examined as described in Q16; and the risk of low government department commitment seems to warrant more than regular information exchange.</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revisions and explanations provided in part due to the removal of the law enforcement component. Please clarify why the law enforcement component was eliminated.</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>Key risks identified.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>B6 lists a number of projects but does not really explain how the project is linked, supports or builds on them. Please explain how the project links to other ongoing/recent activities including - forest cover mapping with USFS, monitoring in BD through the 2005-2009 Darwin project and how it builds on the current national forest inventory.</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>Links to IWCAM, ProEcoServ and other projects identified. Links to fund development and PES projects in other regions identified as important for sharing experience.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Also is there any link to the proposed EMA Biodiversity Assessment, ToR for which are available on the EMA website. March 26, 2012 Adequate revisions and explanations provided.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	December 13, 2011 There is a large number of Trinidad and Tobago government agencies involved in forests as evident through B.5, please provide some additional description of project execution arrangements given the potential for coordination issues which are also identified in B.4. March 26, 2012 Adequate revisions and explanations provided.	March 25, 2014 Implementation through multi-party project steering committee, dedicated project coordination unit and FAO support, both direct and back-stopping as well as a TAG appears adequate.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		March 25, 2014 Changes are actually few and rationale given.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		March 25, 2014 There is no non-grant instrument.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	December 13, 2011 PMC is 4.9%. March 26, 2012 PMC is now 4.7% in this version.	March 25, 2014 PMC is 4.9%

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Please provide additional detail on the TF arrangement as requested above, the explanation on Page 12 is not clear and should be elaborated.</p> <p>Please provide additional justification for the high cost of PA management in Components 2 and 3, and is this the level of expenditure also expected to be met via the TF?</p> <p>March 26, 2012</p> <p>The justification presented in the responses table is not clear. Even 44 and 15/US\$ per hectare is very expensive based on global analyses. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please also note that what we aim to better understand is whether the project is committing to improving management effectiveness of 130,000 hectares or 35,000 hectares. It appears from the text and the project framework it is only 35,000 hectares. Please clarify and answer the original request again with greater clarity.</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>The explanation provided is not adequate. As noted to FAO, please refrain from comparing other project cost structures in order to justify the costs of this project, but rather, provide a rationale that stands on its own that is</p>	<p>March 25, 2014</p> <p>Funding and co-finance appear adequate for the range of activities identified. Co-finance has increased to \$27,720,074 in total giving a ratio of 1:9.9. This is largely due to the addition of Green Fund and EU resources.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		clear, explicit, and precise. April 12, 2012 Adequate explanation provided.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	December 13, 2011 Co-finance is very low at 1:1.86. Please reconsider co-finance options from sources other than the Government. March 26, 2012 Cofinance is now 1:4.	March 25, 2014 Confirmation of co-finance is available for all items.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	December 13, 2011 FAO contribution is \$250k in kind and \$250k (6% of GEF project costs) grant. A higher level of Agency finance would be expected for priority projects. March 26, 2012 FAO contribution not increased and does remain weak overall. The explanation of FAO is not convincing. Please try and improve this amount. April 5, 2012 An increase in cofinance from FAO is being provided.	March 25, 2014 FAO contribution is now \$550k in grant and \$200k in-kind.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		March 25, 2014 The BD TT is available.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		March 25, 2014 M&E plan available that includes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		indicators and targets.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		March 25, 2014 Comments from the German Council Member have been addressed in the FAO ProDoc.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>December 13, 2011 Not at this stage. Please address the issues above.</p> <p>March 26, 2012 No. Please address all issues above including a new endorsement letter from the OFP.</p> <p>April 5, 2012 No. Please respond to the issues raised in questions 14 and 24 above.</p> <p>April 12, 2012 Yes. All issues adequately resolved.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		March 25, 2014 PPG details included.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		March 25, 2014 Yes. CEO Endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	March 25, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	September 4, 2012 Yes planned PPG activities are in line with the project requirements. PPG activities include: 1. Stakeholder consultation 2. Review of legislation and institutional arrangements 3. Collect baseline information and define options for PA management and development 4. Assess improvement needs of infrastructure, equipment and forest restoration 5. Collect information required to develop a sustainable financing plan 6. Assess capacity development needs and develop a capacity development plan and strategies 7. Prioritizing and planning for awareness raising and information dissemination 8. Risk analyses 9. Analyze execution options and assess fiduciary standards 10. Design project components including M&E planning.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	September 4, 2012 Yes, itemized budget is available and is appropriate for PPG activities.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	September 4, 2012 Yes. PPG is recommended for approval.

	4. Other comments	<p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>STAP requests for refinement on the following issues have been included in the PPG:</p> <p>a) Clearer identification of the GEBs and threats - Activity 3, specifically 3.3 and 3.5</p> <p>b) Capacity development - Activity 6 and project sustainability ToR for Forest Economist</p> <p>c) Lessons learned from similar funding initiatives and alternative options - PPG Activity 5 includes review of experience and lessons learned, Tor for Environmental Economist includes development of alternatives.</p>
	Review Date (s)	<p>First review*</p> <p>September 04, 2012</p> <p>Additional review (as necessary)</p>

* 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.