



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

GEF ID:	<b>4610</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Colombia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Adaptation to Climate Impacts in Water Regulation and Supply for the Area of Chingaza - Sumapaz - Guerrero</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IADB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,215,750</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$23,300,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$27,515,750</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Walter Vergara</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Colombia is a developing country, Party to the UNFCCC, and therefore it is eligible for funding under the SCCF.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the OFP has signed a letter of endorsement, for the amount of \$5 million, inclusive of Agency Fees. The letter is signed 23 August 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, the Inter-American Development Bank is the multilateral bank which mandate is the support of development projects in Latin America, with over 50 years of sector experience and a commitment to finance climate change and environmental projects.	

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, IDB has sufficient staff capacity in the country and the project fits into the Agency's program. IDB also has a solid presence in Colombia in water and sanitation sector.	
Resource Availability	6. 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 equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes, the project is requesting \$5 M from the SCCF-A, (Adaptation) for the November 2011 Work Program.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project is aligned with SCCF results framework, specifically with Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Not entirely. This project is consistent with CCA- 1 and CCA-2. The proposal mentions its consistency with CCA-3 as well. However, it is unclear how the project promotes the transfer of adaptation technology.  Recommended action: Please indentify and describe the activities involving the promotion of technology transfer, or consider removing Objective CCA-3 from	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the Strategy Framework Table A.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: CCA-3 is now justified as Activity c) under Component 3 will support the transfer of technology in: i) the establishment of collaborative partnerships between key stakeholders with the common purpose of enhancing technology transfer, ii) design of tech transfer plans, iii) dissemination of technology information through targeted workshops and/or discussion groups.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with the following national plans/strategies: 1) Second National Communication of Colombia, regarding high mountain areas' vulnerability; 2) National Development Plan 2010-2014, which identifies that the Paramos are particularly vulnerable; 3) the policies related to the conservation of biodiversity which are being formulated for the Bogota and the Chingaza-Sumapaz-Guerrero corridor.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>No. The PIF does not describe the measures that will enable the sustainability of the project. Capacity building in Component 2 should contribute to the sustainability of the activities under Component 3, and this is not clear in the PIF. Further information is also needed to demonstrate that the 3 pilots under Output 3.2 and the climate resilient management practices in Output 3.3 are viable, and how they will actually result in climate resilient water use, food security and quality of life.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>information to demonstrate that the activities in the proposal are sustainable, specifically the linkages between capacity built in Component 2 and the activities in Component 3; and the sustainability of the interventions under Outputs 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: The PIF identifies the involvement of local governments and the incorporation of EETA actions to ensure sustainability. Also, the inclusion of tools and risk assessments that will ensure long-term sustainability of activities under Component 3.</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>Not entirely. The proposal mentions one baseline project: IDB loan "Water Supply and Sanitation Services for Rural and Semi Urban Areas" which will invest \$60 M to reduce existing gaps in water and sanitation supply in rural and peri-urban areas. However, the areas of intervention of the baseline project and targeted beneficiaries are not yet defined, therefore it is not clear to what extent the proposed SCCF grant will contribute towards the resilience of the baseline project. The areas of intervention in the baseline must overlap those of the SCCF project, enabling the latter to finance adaptation activities that will make the baseline project resilient, consistent with additional cost reasoning. As it stands, the project appears to finance stand-alone assessments, capacity building and demonstration activities, including such that could take place under BAU.</p> <p>Recommended action: please provide</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>information on the targeted areas and beneficiaries to demonstrate a clear integration of adaptation measures financed under the SCCF into the baseline project.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Target areas will be identified during project preparation.</p> <p>The PIF describes another baseline project, different from the IDB loan "Water Supply and Sanitation Services for Rural and Semi Urban Areas". This is the "Program for Conservation and restoration of mountain wetlands in the area of Chingaza and Sumapaz" which operates in the same geographical area as the SCCF project and through which the EEAB is bringing \$10 M in grant for co-financing. The SCCF project will complement this baseline by adding resources to consider the consequences of CC in the provision of water and particularly on water regulation function under CC scenarios.</p> <p>Regarding the second baseline project, "Water Supply and Sanitation Services" (IDB Hard Loan), the SCCF project will generate the information on adaptation measures that will be used to incorporate the CC dimension in the design of water supply systems.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Not clearly. 1) The proposed SCCF project will build on the baseline project by addressing specific adaptation requirements at the supply side of water regulation within Bogota Metropolitan area. However, it is crucial that the targeted areas and beneficiaries of the baseline are identified, in order to demonstrate that Components 2, 3, and 4 contribute to make the baseline resilient and are based on additional cost reasoning. (See section 11). 2) Furthermore, the activities described under Output 3.1 could be carried out under BAU initiatives and therefore not clearly based on additional cost reasoning. 3) Output 4.1 will design economic/market-based incentives, such as water storage credits. This Output could also be financed under the baseline project, as it could be implemented also in absence of climate change. (If this is not the case, please provide an explanation).</p> <p>Recommended Actions: 1) please provide information on the targeted areas and beneficiaries to demonstrate synergies between baseline and the SCCF project, to ensure that Components 2, 3, and 4 are based on additional cost reasoning. 2) Please provide information on how Output 3.1 contributes to make the baseline resilient. 3) Please provide a strong adaptation case for Output 4.1 as these activities could be financed by the baseline.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Specific target areas will be identified during detailed project formulation.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>On Component 4, the PIF now describes that economic and market- based incentives will respond to climate change effects in other to ensure that they are additional to the BAU efforts: anticipated impacts of CC on hydrology are taken into consideration.</p> <p>Recommended Action: please remove EBA measures from Component 3, (including EBA in Output 3.1).</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: The modifications provided are satisfactory.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not entirely.</p> <p>1) The proposed project activities based on EBA are not clearly additional adaptation activities, but rather restoration and protection activities that could be financed in absence of CC (i.e., business-as-usual scenario).</p> <p>2) Conservation International is currently leading a project on conservation, restoration, and natural resource use, to protect head water and mitigate CC, in the Chingaza- Sumapaz -Guerrero Corridor. The project carried numerous hydrologic modeling studies which resulted in biophysical and socio-economic information which can be used to inform the SCCF project. In this regard, and also considering the studies previously developed under INAP, it is important to justify the need of developing further modeling of CC scenarios under Output 1.1 and vulnerability analysis under Output 1.2.</p> <p>3) CI has organized landowners to participate in sustainable land-use</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>arrangements in the Corridor. Land-use planning, incorporating CC had also been introduced during the implementation of INAP. However Output 2.1 of the proposal aims to incorporate ecosystem based adaptation into land-use planning tools.</p> <p>4) Component 3 seeks to achieve objective CCA-3. However, the technology transfer components are not clearly articulated in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended Actions:</p> <p>1) Please reconsider activities under Component 3, so that these do not follow an EBA approach, as in this case they are business-as-usual activities and not additional adaptation measures. (Accordingly if Component 3 is removed, then Component 2 will become obsolete).</p> <p>2) Please provide sufficient information on how the studies performed by CI and INAP will be used to inform the SCCF project, or/as well as how Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 in the proposal will serve to provide additional and different information from what has already been developed.</p> <p>3) Please provide information to demonstrate that activities regarding land-use tools in Output 2.1 will not duplicate those carried out by CI and introduced by INAP, and how these tools will be sustainable.</p> <p>4) Please clarify the activities in the project that promote adaptation technology transfer.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>22 Sept 2011: The response sheet states that the SCCF project will target different areas than the INAP, it will be a major scale up of the geographical area covered by the INAP. Activities that promote TT have been clarified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please remove the EBA from Components 2 and 3. Please note that the SCCF is not obliged to respond to CBD.</p> <p>Please specify the target areas and municipalities at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: The modifications made are satisfactory. Furthermore, the project has been restructured and component 4 has been removed from the framework. This is satisfactory.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not entirely. It is not clear if the beneficiaries listed in Component 3 and then in section B.3 are in upstream communities or in downstream metropolitan Bogota. The proposal states that the direct beneficiaries are landowners, farmers, communities, and institutions in the "region" (region includes "11 rural areas as well as peri-urban and urban areas of Bogota"). If beneficiaries are upstream, it is necessary to clarify how the 3 pilot projects that will enhance water supply will directly reduce their vulnerability to climate change.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify if the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>targeted beneficiaries are located upstream and downstream, and if upstream, then please provide information on how the interventions will directly contribute to reduce their vulnerability to climate change.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Most beneficiaries have been identified to be downstream as they will benefit from a better regulation system once adaptation measures are in place. The upstream beneficiaries will benefit in the longer term from improved water supply. Component 3 will benefit approximately 1,750 individuals.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Not entirely. The proposal states that the direct beneficiaries of the project will be inhabitants, communities, and institutions who will participate in the Corridor development. It is unclear if these involve only upstream beneficiaries. If so, more information is needed on how their vulnerability to CC will be reduced through water enhancement.</p> <p>Recommended action: please provide detailed information that links the adaptation interventions to the reduction of vulnerability of upstream communities and farmers. Please clarify the consideration of gender issues in the project.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: The response sheet does not address the inclusion of gender.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please ensure</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>inclusion of gender in the adaptation activities.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: The modified proposal includes activities that will be used to streamline gender considerations in the project, namely, a Gender-Sensitive Vulnerability Analysis, Gender-sensitive project design, building capacity on gender-sensitive development, and gender-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation system.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Not clearly. The roles of CSO's and indigenous people are not clearly identified and addressed.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address the roles of CSOs and indigenous people in the project.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: The response sheet states that the roles of CSO's will be identified upon the identification of nature and scope of adaptation actions.</p> <p>Recommended Action: please identify the involvement of CSO's in the project.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: The CSOs will be identified during project preparation. This is acceptable.</p>	
	<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</p>	<p>No, the PIF in its current form does not address risks thoroughly, or provide detailed mitigation actions. Further information is needed on the capacities of the strategic local actors listed in risk 1 and the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	<p>consultation process. The mitigation actions for risk 2 describe workshops, training and raising awareness of the local communities during project preparation. However, these activities are not listed under the project's components and it is therefore unclear if they will be undertaken by the SCCF project.</p> <p>Component 4 lacks co-financing and therefore the viability and sustainability of the economic/market incentives described is not clear, posing a risk to the realization of this component.</p> <p>Recommended action: please provide further information on the mitigation measures for the potential risks listed. Please clarify if the mitigation activities listed in risk #2 will be undertaken within the SCCF project components. Please provide information to demonstrate that the economic/market incentives in Component 4 will be viable and sustainable.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: In order to address the potential risks, the project will ensure active participation of local actors and these activities will be structured during project design phase. The PIF now includes a new Output (1.4) which will implement workshops and training sessions of successful adaptive management experiences to the baseline projects as part of the mitigation activities under risk #2. To help the sustainability of component 4, Co-financing has been added, in the amount</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of \$200,000.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Not fully. 1) As it stands, the proposal appears to duplicate some efforts undertaken by the SPA-financed project, Integrated National Adaptation Plan (INAP). Output 1.1 of the proposal seems to be duplicating the activities under Output 1.3 of the INAP project: "climate scenarios to develop ecosystem management plans, land conservation, and adaptation options in Paramo".</p> <p>Moreover, land-use planning tools were also introduced in the INAP project; these are again proposed under Output 2.1 of this proposal, which aims to incorporate ecosystem based adaptation into land-use planning tools.</p> <p>Further information is necessary to ensure that there is no overlapping of efforts with the project implemented by CI in the Corridor. Furthermore, in its current form, the PIF does not provide sufficient information on the coordination mechanisms in place, to ensure that there is no duplication between the proposal and the other three regional initiatives (PRICC, "We are Water", and the District Department of Environment project).</p> <p>Component 2 in the proposal seeks to address institutional strengthening. Some institutional capacity was already strengthened during the implementation of INAP, especially IDEAM. Therefore it is not clear how the capacities built under</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 2 will contribute to make the baseline resilient.</p> <p>According to IDEAM, (<a href="http://www.slideshare.net/InfoAndina/inap-hipervinculo">http://www.slideshare.net/InfoAndina/inap-hipervinculo</a>) one of the achievements of the INAP project was the development of a Protocol for Monitoring and Modeling of the water cycles and high mountain ecosystems of Rio Blanco basin in Chingaza massif. Concerning this, there is no clarification in the PIF to demonstrate that justify Output 1.3 .</p> <p>Recommended Actions: 1)Please provide additional information to ensure that the CI project and the additional 3 activities in the region mentioned in the PIF do not duplicate efforts. Please also provide the coordination mechanisms in place to ensure this:</p> <p>2) justification for land-use tools in Output 2.1 including information that they will not duplicate those carried out by CI and introduced by INAP. 3) justification for the capacity building under Component 2, namely how it will contribute to the resilience of the baseline and how it does not duplicate efforts previously made through INAP. 4) further information on Output 1.3 of the proposed project, including specifically how it will differ from the results of the INAP project.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011:</p> <p>1. The project will target a much larger geographic area than INAP. Climate information generated under INAP must be adjusted with other geographic information,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>at appropriate levels 1:25,000. This had not been done before.</p> <p>2. This project will take capacity building efforts to the regional environmental organisms and other local stakeholders.</p> <p>3. CI will maintain a constant and open communication with different stakeholders in the area through periodic workshops and thematic discussion groups.</p> <p>4. Already addressed in point 1.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>No. The proposal in its current form does not provide information on the execution arrangements, nor on the institutions that will participate in the implementation.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please describe the execution arrangements of the project.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Project will be executed by CI in close coordination with IDEAM as scientific-technical body, and on behalf of the Ministry of Environment in a manner similar to the modus operandi under INAP. Details of the execution arrangements will be defined under project preparation.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project	No. Project management cannot exceed 5%	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	<p>of the total SCCF grant. Consistent with the discussions recently held between the GEF and its agencies regarding PM costs, it is requested to review this cost so that it is at most 5% of the SCCF grant.</p> <p>Recommended action: please revise PM costs, so that they do not exceed 5% of the total SCCF Grant.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: PM costs should be revised not to exceed 5%. Please revise.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: The PM cost has been revised to 5% of the project cost. However, please see the comment under #24, as an adjustment of the project cost is recommended.</p> <p>9/27/2011 Requested changes have been made.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Yes. Co-financing consists \$23.3 M, from \$21.4 M is a hard loan from IDB through its Water Supply and Sanitation Services Program in Colombia. The co-financing ratio is 1:5.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Co-financing has been revised as to include a grant from the baseline project of EEAB, in the amount of \$10 M. IDB's hard loan co-financing has been reduced to \$11.4 M. The total co-financing amount remains the same.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: Although the PM cost have been revised to 5%, and component 4 "Adoption of economic and institutional</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>incentives for adaptation" in the amount of USD 300,000 is dropped, this has not been reflected in the total project costs.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the figures so that the subtotal (before PM costs) is lower by USD 300,000, and accordingly, that the PM costs are no more than 5%.</p> <p>9/27/2011 Requested changes have been made.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>See section 24.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>Yes. IDB is bringing \$21.4 M hard loan contribution to the project, through the Water Supply and Sanitation Services for Rural and Semi-Urban Areas.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: IDB is now bringing \$11.4 M in co-financing, as a hard loan.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not yet. Please address the issues raised in Sections 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 23.</p> <p>22 Sept 2011: Not yet. Please address issues in Sections 13, 14, 16, 17, and 23.</p> <p>26 Sept 2011: Please address #23 and #24.</p> <p>27 Sept 2011: Yes. All pending issues have been resolved and approval is now recommended.</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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 22, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 27, 2011	
	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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
<b>PPG Budget</b>	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	
	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.