



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

GEF ID:	5194		
Country/Region:	Rwanda		
Project Title:	Building Resilience of Communities Living in Degraded Forests, Savannahs and Wetlands of Rwanda Through an Ecosystem Management Approach		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,500,000
Co-financing:	\$9,244,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,844,000
PIF Approval:	March 26, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	May 02, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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. Rwanda is a LDC and has completed its NAPA.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An endorsement letter signed by the GEF OFP Dr. Rose Mukankomeje and dated October 19 2012 is included.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP has a comparative advantage in providing proof of concept and the best available science and knowledge upon which investments can be based. The proposed project focuses on optimizing ecosystem management to support climate change adaptation in Rwanda. UNEP's expertise lies in	YES. No change from PIF.

*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)
		providing technical advice on ecosystem management and therefore it has a comparative advantage for this implementing this project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. UNEP has been active in the country since 1994 and has worked closely with the governmental and non-governmental partners in Rwanda. UNEP has either worked in the past or has active ongoing projects with the proposed executing agencies in the country.	YES. No change from PIF.
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. The current funding request of \$5.5 million is within the resources available in the LDCF based on the principle of equitable access.	YES. No change from PIF.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is aligned with the LDCF results framework.	YES.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute to all three LDCF objectives.	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 and,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>No. The project description only lists the national strategies and plans that the proposed project is consistent with and does not provide information on the specifics within the strategies and plans the proposed project will directly address.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please discuss the items under each national strategy and plan that the project will respond to.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Requested information has been provided.</p>	<p>specifically, outcomes 1.2, 1.3, 2.2 and 3.2.</p> <p>YES. The proposed project would address several of Rwanda's NAPA priorities, including on integrated water resources management, alternative income-generating activities, agricultural intensification and diversified, climate-resilient agricultural varieties; and it draws upon the findings of Rwanda's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC. In addition, the project is aligned with relevant national policies and development planning frameworks, including the Rwanda Environmental Policy, the National Forestry Policy, the Land Policy, the Vision 2020 and the National Strategy on Climate Change and Low-Carbon Development.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p> <p>11/03/2015 " YES. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p>
	<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>Yes. Loss of forests due to unmanaged firewood collection, overstocking of livestock and land clearance of agriculture, draining of marshes for agricultural purposes, and soil erosion are the stated as the problems that are affecting agriculture, energy, transport and health sectors of the country.</p> <p>The baseline projects that are addressing these issues are as follows:</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a clear description of the baseline situation, specifically with respect to the relationship between the unsustainable management of land and natural resources, the vulnerability of rural populations and livelihoods to the adverse effects of climate change and other natural hazards, and the persistent, high levels of poverty and food insecurity.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Land Husbandry, Water Catchment and Hillside Irrigation Rural Sector Support Project Project d' Appui a la Reforestation au Rwanda (PAREF)</p> <p>The baseline projects are sufficiently described for the PIF stage.</p>	<p>The proposed LDCF grant would build on and strengthen (i) the Projet d'Appui a la Reforestation au Rwanda; (ii) the Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project (LWH); (iii) the Rural Sector Support Project, Phase 3; and (iv) the China-Rwanda International Research Partnership on Long-Term Ecosystem Monitoring.</p> <p>While the baseline initiatives seem relevant and the Request for CEO Endorsement describes how these would be enhanced through additional, LDCF-financed measures; it is not clear to what extent the proposed grant could shift projects that are scheduled to close in 2016 or 2017, particularly by strengthening the capacities of their management teams (as proposed for [i] and [ii] above).</p> <p>Moreover, the Request should clarify the duration and the sources of co-financing associated with each project and ensure that the latter are consistent with Table C.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how the proposed project could meaningfully shift baseline investments that are scheduled to close in 2016 or 2017; (ii) provide the intended duration of the Rwanda-China research partnership; (iii) clarify the source of co-financing associated with LWH; and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>(iv) ensure that all relevant sources and amounts of co-financing are consistently described across Table C and Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies how the proposed LDCF grant would complement and enhance baseline investments, particularly by strengthening the capacities of the participating government agencies, and it provides a consistent description of the duration of the each baseline investment and the associated co-financing.</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>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 13 and 15 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 13 and 15, please revisit and strengthen the description of cost-effectiveness in Section B.3 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to sections 13 and 15 below.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Not Clear. The proposal describes climate risks in the country, and presents ecosystem management and restoration as a viable solution. However, effects of climate change on the baseline projects and on the goals they intend to achieve have not been discussed. Also, the proposal does not describe the inadequacy of the baseline</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. In absence of further clarity regarding some of the baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed additional measures, the project contains 13 outputs, some of which present a limited</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>projects in dealing with such risks.</p> <p>As described, adaptation interventions and benefits have focus on ecosystems and their well-being. Communities and their risks appear to be secondary.</p> <p>It is also unclear how ecosystem management alone will be able to tackle the cited problems of drought, famine, flooding, and climate related disasters.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please describe how baseline projects and their intended goals will be affected by climate change and please explain how the baseline projects in their current form are not adequate to respond to these risks.</p> <p>Please review section B.2 keeping vulnerable communities in focus, the array of climate risks they face, and the role ecosystems may play in reducing their vulnerability. Please follow the GEF Operational Guidelines GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06 sequentially to establish the additional cost reasoning for the project.</p> <p>Addition of other supporting activities in addition to ecosystem management would make the proposed project more suited to address the climate risks and provide more viable reasoning for additional costs.</p>	<p>value added, and the project framework could be streamlined accordingly.</p> <p>In particular, with respect to Component 1, the rationale for establishing a national steering committee solely for EbA is not clear. It would seem more appropriate to incorporate eco-system based strategies and measures across all relevant adaptation policies and plans, and the associated steering and coordination mechanisms.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the proposed policy revisions would seem to be of limited value unless they result in actual changes in policies and plans. To achieve this, the project could identify fewer, clear entry points for policy reform. See also Section 15 below.</p> <p>With respect to Component 3, finally, it is unclear why limited project resources would need to be dispersed across such a large number of demonstration projects, particularly given that many of the proposed approaches and technologies have already been tested through LDCF-financed and other adaptation projects and programs in Rwanda and beyond.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11 above, please (i) strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. In addition, please (ii) clarify the rationale</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>3/7/2013 Not entirely clear. The clarifications given on the climate change risks to the baseline projects and the details on the geographic locations of the project intervention provide necessary information on the additional cost reasoning. However, the section B.2.4 on "Adaptation interventions and benefits" provides only general information.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: It would be appropriate to replace B.2.4 with section B.2.5. Per the suggestions made during the bilateral meeting with the agency, please remove references to ecosystem engineering and hyperbeneficial systems.</p> <p>3/20/2013 Yes. Requested changes have been made.</p>	<p>for establishing a national steering committee solely for EbA and consider alternative approaches; (iii) revisit Component 2 based on clearer targets for policy reform; (iv) consider focusing Component 3 on fewer sites, demonstration projects and technologies for greater impact; and, based on above changes; (v) consider streamlining the project framework with fewer outputs.</p> <p>11/03/2015 " YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant. In particular, the revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies that added value of the steering committee referenced under Component 1, and recognizes that the investment activities proposed under Component 3 are indeed not merely intended to demonstrate technologies.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not clear. The proposed project comprises of three components geared towards providing technical assistance and also undertaking investment activities to provide adaptation benefits through ecosystem management.</p> <p>Overall for all components the primary focus seems to be ecosystem management and restoration with the expectation and assumption that such actions would aid in climate change adaptation. The components need to be</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>11/03/2015 " YES. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>adjusted to establish the focus on populations that are vulnerable to climate change, determining ecosystem services that are/will be critical for their well-being and developing feasible ways to manage ecosystems to ensure delivery of such services.</p> <p>Recommended Actions:</p> <p>For component 1, please explain how support towards PhD and MSc theses will directly aid the project goals of reducing vulnerability of target populations in Rwanda. It is suggested that such research be built to aid and develop suitable ecosystem management plans for the targeted areas.</p> <p>The component sets out to develop management plans for wide-range of ecosystems. Please adjust the focus on communities and the types of ecosystems that are identified to be critical for their livelihoods especially under the climate change.</p> <p>For component 2, please clarify whether the first three expected outputs are geared towards national level or district level.</p> <p>For component 3, it is vital that climate risks that target communities face are clearly identified. Through analysis and consultation please identify specific ecosystem services that are vital for the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communities' well-being under the changing climate and finally establish that ecosystem restoration will ensure provision of the services and reduce climate change vulnerability.</p> <p>Instead of hyper-beneficial biodiversity rich ecosystems, the component should focus on ecosystem services that are vital for the communities and devise ways to generate those services and products. The concepts of hyper-beneficial ecosystems and ecosystem engineering should be replaced with species that are known to be adaptive and important to continue generation of ecosystem services necessary for vulnerable communities.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Not entirely clear. The requested changes have been made in components 1 and 2. However, the expected output (3.1) of component 3 still focuses on biodiversity, though the response sheet states otherwise.</p> <p>Recommended Actions Please revise the output according to the previous comments provided for component 3.</p> <p>3/20/2013 Yes. Requested changes have been made to focus on climate resiliency.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not entirely. Please see comments for sections 13 and 14.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Yes. Though some clarifications are still pending on the additional cost reasoning, the overall methodology and assumptions are sound.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>The overall number of beneficiaries is quite modest relative to the resources that would be invested in tangible demonstration activities (>\$3,500/person).</p> <p>With regard to Component 1, Indicator 4 should rather refer to the extent to which curricula have actually been revised and implemented.</p> <p>Similarly, with regard to Component 2, Indicator 1 should rather refer to the number and extent to which policies and plans have actually been revised.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 13, please (i) adjust the results framework accordingly. In addition, (ii) justify the overall number of beneficiaries and hectares targeted in light of the proposed LDCF allocation towards tangible demonstration activities; (iii) replace indicator 4 under Component 1 as well as Indicator 1 under Component 2 to capture actual changes in curricula and policies, respectively.</p> <p>11/03/2015 – YES. The project results framework and the expected adaptation benefits have been revised as recommended.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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 clear. The project will strengthen the technical capacity of governmental and academic institutions in Rwanda regarding ecosystem management approach to climate change adaptation. However, actual tangible benefits to the communities at risk are not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Following comments from previous sections please establish a clear linkage between reduction in climate change vulnerability of communities with restoration activities proposed in the project.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Yes. Socio-economic benefits that the local communities will achieve through the project activities have been clearly described.</p> <p>Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement: Please devise mechanisms that will facilitate involvement of women in the project and also please highlight the additional measures that the project will take to generate adaptation benefits for women.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 15 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 15, please adjust Section B.2 of the Request for CEO Endorsement accordingly, particularly with regard to the expected number of beneficiaries.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to Section 15 above.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage:Please identify NGOs and local level organizations that could contribute towards and benefit from the project.</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including CSOs, is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	Yes.	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures are adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes for PIF stage. Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage: Please determine how and at which stage the proposed project will coordinate and work with other related initiatives.	YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives is clearly described in the Request for CEO Endorsement. Please refer to Section 13 above, however, regarding Component 3.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes for PIF stage. Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage: Please describe by CEO endorsement stage roles of each of the executing agencies in implementing each of the project components.	YES.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 23 below. 11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to Section 23 below.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The requested PMC is 4% of the total grant requested.	NOT CLEAR. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management has increased by 37 per cent from \$225,000 to \$307,824 or 6 per cent of the sub-total for project components. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the proposed LDCF funding

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. The proposed LDCF funding share of project management costs has been adjusted as recommended, to \$261,025 or less than five per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>Indicative co-financing for the project is \$9.2 million. The national government will be providing the entire co-financing amount.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please ensure that appropriate confirmation is provided for each source and amount of co-financing.</p> <p>11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>No. UNEP is not bringing any co-financing towards the project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please indicate whether UNEP will be able to provide</p>	<p>YES. No change from PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		co-financing for the proposed project. 3/7/2013 Yes. UNEP has added \$1.5 million as co-financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 13 and 15 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 13 and 15, please adjust the targets in the tracking tool accordingly. 11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to sections 13 and 15 above.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• Council comments?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 13, please revisit the responses to Council comments, particularly regarding the proposed National Steering Committee and policy reform. 11/03/2015 “ YES. Please refer to Section 13 above.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see comments for sections 9, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 26. 3/7/2013 Not yet. Please see comments for sections 13, and 14. 3/20/2013 Yes. All pending issues have been addressed.	
	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?		YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27 and 29. 11/03/2015 – YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 17, 2012	July 02, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2013	November 03, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	No PPG submission was received (not recorded in the internal system). 3/7/2013 Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	3/7/2013 Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	3/7/2013 Not yet. PPG approval is contingent upon the PIF approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 18, 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.