



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

GEF ID:	5263		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Resilience of Poor Communities to Urban Flooding in Yaounde		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,032,000
Co-financing:	\$156,280,000	Total Project Cost:	\$160,312,000
PIF Approval:	April 24, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mbaye El Hadji Amadou

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 ?	YES. Cameroon is a non-Annex I country party to the UNFCCC and is eligible under the SCCF.	YES. Cameroon is a non-Annex I Party to the UNFCCC.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated January 16, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of		

*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)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	YES. The proposed grant (\$4,415,040 including Agency fee) is available under the SCCF Technology Transfer Program (SCCF-B).	YES. No change from PIF.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<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>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised significantly from the Council Approved PIF without any justification in Section A.2 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>While the proposed focus on strategic objective CCA-3, outcome 3.1 seems appropriate given that the project seeks funds from SCCF-B, the project would also seem to contribute towards CCA-2 and outcomes 2.1 and 2.3 in particular. In addition, the project would seem highly relevant for outcome 3.2, ‘Enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer’.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 7 and 8 below, please revisit the Focal Area Strategy Framework and ensure that all relevant strategic objectives and associated outcomes are identified.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. As recommended, the Focal Area Strategy Framework includes outcome CCA-3.2.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>YES. The proposed SCCF project is closely aligned with Cameroon's Growth and Employment Strategy (GESP), as well as the first National Communication to the UNFCCC (2005). The project is also consistent with Cameroon's National Plan for Climate change, initiated in August 2012.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please reference any relevant information pertaining to water, sanitation or urban planning/development, as shown in strategies/plans listed. For example, the GESP document (2010-2020) identifies "Urban Development and Housing" and "Water and Sanitation" as growth areas, in line with the SCCF project (See: http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sctr/2010/cr10257.pdf).</p> <p>For each growth area, the document lists several implementation strategies, such as "maintaining and rehabilitating urban infrastructure", and "improving access to basic urban services". This level of detail would be recommended at CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>YES. No change from PIF. The proposed project is aligned with the Cameroon's National Strategy for Waste Management, the Growth and Employment Strategy Paper, the findings of the country's Initial National Communications and its National Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change.</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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed SCCF project is associated with AfDB's ongoing efforts to improve Yaounde's drainage systems, and describes 2 phases of baseline activities to which the project will build. However, the PIF lacks sufficient detail on current progress towards baseline project objectives (i), (ii) and (iii) (pg.4) - more specifically, in regard to phase 1 activities (which began in 2005). It is also not clear how</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a concise description of the baseline situation, the associated climate change risks, the achievements and shortcomings of past measures to enhance flood protection and drainage, and the baseline project (PADY 2).</p> <p>For clarity, the Request for CEO Endorsement could provide the intended</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>financing for the 2 phases (\$130.5 million) (pg.4) relate to project components in Table B, and co-financing amounts in Table C, which calculate to \$120 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (1) progress made towards achieving baseline project objectives, and (2) how baseline investments described relate to project components (Table B) and indicative co-financing (Table C).</p> <p>04/11/2013 – YES. The re-submission adequately describes activities completed during phase 1 (pg.5), and how baseline project outputs relate to the proposed SCCF components and co-financing, as requested.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please describe each of the 10 baseline project components (outputs) listed on pg.5. Also describe the baseline scenario related to Cameroon's institutional capacity for urban planning and management, as they relate to component 1.</p>	<p>duration of PADY 2, and clarify whether and how the baseline activities would be sequenced in order for the SCCF-financed assessments and guidelines to provide the greatest possible value added.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the intended duration of PADY 2 and (ii) whether and how the baseline activities would be sequenced.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The revised request for CEO Endorsement clarifies that PADY 2 would run for four years until 2018, and provides a clear description of the sequencing of baseline investments vis-à-vis the proposed, SCCF-financed adaptation measures.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project framework (Table B) lacks an objective. An objective should be included.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (1) revise the project framework accordingly, and (2) include an objective.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 below. There appears to be some inconsistency in the description of SCCF-financed activities. The components, outcomes and outputs described in the project framework (Table B) and the project results framework (Annex A) are not clearly reflected in the description of the additional reasoning (Section A.5) or the Appraisal Report (Section III).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>04/11/2013 -- YES. Recommendations in sections 6 and 8 have been addressed. Indicative co-financing figures have been revised accordingly, and a project objective has been included in the project framework.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please ensure that the proposed, SCCF-financed activities are clearly and consistently described in the project framework and other relevant sections of the Request for CEO Endorsement and Appraisal Report.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear, and the proposed components, outcomes and outputs are consistent with the description provided in Section A.5 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The additional cost reasoning could be further strengthened.</p> <p>Please refer to section 6.</p> <p>Additionally, for component 1, the PIF cites that "climate change risk are integrated into policies, regulations and urban planning" (Table B), but, in the component description (pg.6) does not provide examples of the existing policies or regulations to which risks will be integrated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6 above, please (1) strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. And, (2) provide examples to policies and regulations to which climate change risks will be integrated, and (3) clarify how</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. It would seem important that the baseline activities are timed in such a manner that allows the SCCF-financed assessments and guidelines to inform and guide their design and implementation.</p> <p>Moreover, the activities proposed for SCCF-financing are somewhat inconsistently described. Section A.5 of the Request for CEO Endorsement is focused on information, education and communication activities and provides little information as to the tangible adaptation measures that would be carried out. It also seems that a baseline study and/or vulnerability assessment has yet to be carried out, the reasons for which are not well understood given that a PPG of \$125,000 was approved in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>locations or communities will be selected under components 2 and 3.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The project identifies relevant strategies and plans into which adaptation will be integrated (pg. 6). The PIF also clarifies that the project would target vulnerable communities in informal settlements adjacent to the baseline investments, based on public consultations.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a clear methodology to how component activities (as shown on pgs. 6 -7) will be implemented.</p>	<p>April 2013 (see also Section 19 below).</p> <p>The proposed project seeks funds under SCCF-B, but it remains unclear what technologies the project would transfer. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool refers to landscaping, green spaces and grassing river banks, but it is unclear in what sense the targeted households (1,000 according to AMAT) would adopt the proposed technologies. It is also not clear whether this list of technologies is exhaustive, noting that the project would promote a community-based approach to planning, identifying and implementing appropriate technologies to reduce flood risks.</p> <p>As for the expected adaptation benefits, the project results framework could provide more specific targets and metrics (e.g. number of people trained [share of whom are women], clear baselines and metrics for flood frequency and water pollution, and measurable baselines and targets for losses under Outcome 2.1; as well as measurable targets and baselines for "natural adaptation" and "improved infiltration", and number of households or individuals that adopt more resilient technologies under Outcome 3.1).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) clarify how the proposed SCCF-financed activities</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>would inform, guide and complement the baseline PADY 2 with a view to addressing the additional cost of climate change adaptation; (ii) in Section A.5 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, please provide a clear description of each component, the relevant gaps and vulnerabilities identified in the baseline scenario, and the additional activities proposed for SCCF financing; (iii) justify the need for/ relevance of a baseline study and/or vulnerability assessment given the activities financed through the PPG; (iv) identify more specifically what technologies the proposed project will transfer, and clarify to what extent the relevant technologies will be selected on the basis of community-level planning; (v) define more clearly the expected adaptation benefits, with measurable baselines and targets, where applicable.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The re-submission provides a clearer and more coherent description of the proposed components, outcomes and outputs. The expected adaptation benefits have also been adequately clarified.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please clarify the expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions of the proposed project, with measurable targets, where</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>applicable.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions have been adequately clarified in the revised Request for CEO Endorsement.</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>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please clarify how public participation will be ensured during both project preparation and implementation.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. It is not clear to what extent local communities have been consulted during project preparation and whether such consultations were supported by the PPG. See also Section 19 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please (i) clarify whether and how local communities would carry out adaptation planning with a view to identifying the most appropriate technologies and measures for reducing vulnerability, in addition to the pre-identified technologies (landscaping, green spaces and grassing river banks); and describe (ii) how and to what extent local communities have been consulted during project preparation.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately described in the revised Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies solid waste disposal, and water and sanitation problems to be major risks, and proposes various mitigation measures. However, the document could also consider operational risks such as project delays or poor co-ordination with stakeholders that</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately identified.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>could equally hamper progress towards objectives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include operational risks that could also prevent the achievement of project objectives.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. Operational risks have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that there are several bilateral and multilateral donors involved in the water and sanitation sector (pg. 9), but does not describe these relevant initiatives. Furthermore, the document should also indicate any initiatives related to the community-based adaptation measures proposed under component 3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please list the other relevant initiatives with which coordination will be sought.</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and complementarity with other relevant initiatives have been adequately described.</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 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. The proposed project includes a number of innovative aspects, and relevant pathways for scaling up, but these cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, sustainability and scaling up, as appropriate.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please clarify how the proposed project would promote innovation, sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies that the proposed SCCF grant would play a crucial role in informing city-level policies, planning and investments</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>scaling up the project's intervention.</p>	<p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The proposed project introduces policy reforms, information products and services, as well as proven technologies to enhance the resilience of vulnerable urban communities in the face of climate change -induced hazards, particularly floods.</p> <p>The project would be fully integrated into considerable baseline investments in urban water and sanitation services, and it would contribute directly towards integrating climate change adaptation into relevant city-level development policies and plans. As a result, the proposed project is well placed to generate sustainable adaptation benefits with considerable potential for scaling up.</p>	<p>through comprehensive vulnerability assessments, flood risks maps, revised building guidelines; as well as by enhancing the technical and institutional capacities of relevant municipal authorities as well as local communities to address climate change -induced flood risks.</p> <p>The project would also be fully integrated into considerable baseline investments in urban water and sanitation services. As a result, the proposed project is well placed to generate sustainable adaptation benefits with considerable potential for scaling up.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that all relevant changes from PIF are adequately justified in Section A of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</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>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. In absence further information regarding the technologies that the proposed project would transfer and their relative cost-effectiveness; along with clear, measurable baselines and targets to capture the expected adaptation benefits, the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project has not been adequately demonstrated.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project, including through a comparison of the proposed technologies with alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please see section 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the grant and co-financing figures per component, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The indicative co-financing amounts in tables A, B and C, have been revised as recommended.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts in Table B accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component seem adequate and appropriate.</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>NOT CLEAR. In line with its role, AfDB would bring \$120 million to the project. However, there is a slight mismatch in figures: co-financing is indicated as \$120 million in Table C, but as \$130.5 million in section A of PIF (pg.4).</p> <p>Please see section 6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6, please revisit the co-financing figures, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The indicative co-</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. There is no confirmation of AfDB co-financing.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide appropriate confirmation of AfDB co-financing.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		financing figures have been revised as recommended.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$190,000, or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-4, the proposed SCCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	YES. The proposed SCCF funding level for project management is appropriate at \$190,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 4.
	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. A PPG of \$125,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	NO. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a report on status of the PPG. 07/25/2014 -- YES.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 4 above, please ensure that the AMAT is completed with baselines and targets for all relevant indicators. 07/25/2014 -- YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool has been completed with baselines and targets for relevant indicators, consistent with the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A).
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results		YES.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>NOT CLEAR. Annex B lacks a response to the STAP review and recommendations.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a response to the STAP review.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to the recommendations made in Section 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations made in Section 8, please adjust the responses to Council comments accordingly, as necessary.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>04/11/2013 – YES.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 5,6 and 8.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 23.</p> <p>07/25/2014 -- YES.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*	April 02, 2013	May 13, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2013	
	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.