



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

GEF ID:	6968		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Chad National Adaptation Plan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5431 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,775,000
Co-financing:	\$27,905,900	Total Project Cost:	\$33,980,900
PIF Approval:	June 03, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	July 05, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Katya Kuang-Idba	Agency Contact Person:	Ms. Clotilde Goeman

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. Chad is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	GEFSEC, 1/9/2017 - YES. As at PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated August 14, 2014, is attached to the submission.	GEFSEC, 1/9/2018- Yes. As at PIF.
Resource Availability	3. 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	YES. The proposed grant is available	GEFSEC, 1/9/2018 - Yes. As at 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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		NA
Strategic Alignment	<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>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) cites CCA outcomes associated with the previous programming strategy (2010-14).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide, in Table A, the CCA objectives towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute, consistent with the 2014-18 Programming Strategy on Adaptation, along with the associated grant and co-financing amounts.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- YES. Table A has been revised as recommended. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/9/2018 - Yes. As at PIF, the proposed project will address LDCF strategic objectives strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation (CCA-2); and integrate climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, and associated processes (CCA-3).</p>
	<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 project addresses Chad's NAPA priorities associated with information, education and communication; climate information services; and policy development. The project is also anchored in Chad's National Development Plan (2013-2015).</p> <p>Importantly, however, the proposed project aims to strengthen national development planning and budgeting processes by integrating climate change risks and adaptation.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/9/2018 - Yes. This project directly supports Chad's NAP process and the NAP road map. Additionally, the project addresses NAPA priorities 4 (information, education and communication on climate change), 8 (policy development for climate change), and 10 (climate risk management and establishment of a system for climate prediction, analysis, and interpretation of forecast results). The project also responds to national priorities articulated in existing national planning instruments, such as Vision</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			2030, Chad's national development plan (2017-2021), and climate priorities identified in Chad's NDC, including "support to institutions to set priorities for adaptation according to the socio-economic sectors based on the needs of the population, and to promote intersectoral consistency, particularly on the preparation of the National Adaptation Plan."
Project Design	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>NOT CLEAR. Overall the PIF provides a clear overview of the baseline scenario associated with each component, along with the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing.</p> <p>For Component 2, however, it remains unclear to what extent climate change risks and adaptation are incorporated into relevant national development plans, and what gaps and needs the proposed project would fill in this respect. Specifically, it seems climate change adaptation is already a priority in the National Development Plan (2013-2015).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify the baseline scenario associated with Component 2 and, specifically, the extent to which climate change risks and adaptation are incorporated into relevant national development plans.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies the baseline scenario associated with Component 2 as recommended.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/15/2018 - More information requested. There are two additional sources of co-financing in Table C which are not sufficiently described in the proposal under baseline scenario. One of the projects, Global Climate Change Alliance/GCCA is described both as a baseline project as well as one the proposed LDCF project will coordinate with. Additionally, the "HYdroMet Project is also listed in Table C, with a brief bullet mention on page 12, but without additional detail.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider moving the description of the GCCA initiative from coordination/partnerships to baseline scenario. Please consider briefly detailing the HYdroMet project mentioned in Table C and on page 12, and justifying the use of LDCF financing within the context of that project.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/13/2018 - Cleared. The Agency has clarified that the GCCA project is not one with which the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>proposed project will coordinate with, but rather a baseline investment. While the GCCA project is also mainstreaming climate adaptation, the proposed LDCF project complements the GCCA project by focusing on strengthening the observation network, which is not addressed by the EU-funded initiative, as well as putting an emphasis on climate change integration into sectoral and regional planning. The lead ministry that implements the GCCA project is closely involved in the development of the present project and will ensure that it builds on existing activities.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>Moreover, the objective -- to develop the national adaptation plan -- seems like an output rather than an objective, and is included among the outputs that contribute towards Outcome 2 on integration adaptation into policies and budgets in vulnerable sectors.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly, as appropriate; and (ii) revise the objective with a view to developing a sound results hierarchy.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/12/2018 - Update requested. Some of the outputs in Table B are unclear and/or not quantifiable, which could be problematic for this stage of project development.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1 "Existing hydro-meteorological network is assessed and strengthened through the provision of supplementary equipment"; - Output 1.4 "The technical capacities of ANAM and dDRE staff on the use and maintenance of the hydrometeorological network and the processing and analysis of data are strengthened"; output; -Output 2.3 The integration of climate change into development at national, sectoral and regional levels is strengthened; <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please re-articulate the outputs in question as to ensure they are tangible and measurable.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			GEFSEC, 2/13/2018 - Cleared. The agency has re-articulated the outputs in question to ensure they are tangible and measurable.
	<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. Please refer to Section 6 above. In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario for Component 2, the additional reasoning and adaptation benefits cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>Specifically, with reference to relevant gaps and needs related to the integration of adaptation into existing national development policies, plans and planning processes; and given Chad's relatively recent NAPA of 2010; the PIF could provide a clearer rationale for the proposed national adaptation plan and implementation strategy.</p> <p>In addition, the PIF could further specify to what extent the proposed project would "facilitate the integration of climate change vulnerability and risks into the formulation of policies". Which policies would be targeted and how would this integration relate to the proposed national adaptation plan?</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. Specifically, (i) clarify how the proposed national adaptation plan and implementation strategy would address</p>	GEFSEC, 1/15/2018 - Yes. The proposed project will develop climate information tools and integrate adaptation into long-term sectoral planning processes at multiple levels, enabling institutions and communities to identify risks associated with climate change, as well as priority response measures; thereby contributing to reduced vulnerability through various entrypoints.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>relevant gaps and needs, and how these would add value to the 2010 NAPA, which remains in its early stages of implementation; (ii) clarify which policies would be targeted for the integration of climate change risks and adaptation; and (iii) how such integration would relate to the proposed national adaptation plan.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been clarified.</p> <p>Still, it remains unclear how the "national plans " with adaptation priorities (second indicative output under Component 2) relate to the integration of adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral policy-making and planning processes (third indicative output under Component 3). Will adaptation-specific plans be developed in parallel with development plans that incorporate adaptation options?</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify further how the "national plans" with adaptation priorities relate to the integration of adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral policy-making and planning processes; and whether adaptation-specific plans would be developed in parallel with development plans that incorporate adaptation options.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies that the proposed project would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		integrate adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral planning processes; while adaptation plans will be considered, in a country-driven manner, among the means of achieving such integration, and framing the country's adaptation priorities.	
	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>GEFSEC, 1/15/2018 - More information requested. Section A.7 does not adequately describe the socio-economic benefits delivered by this project or how the delivery of these benefits support the achievement of adaptation benefits.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly describe how the wider availability of more accurate climate information and avoiding projected production losses will translate into social and economic benefits for the target population. Additionally, as conflict sensitivity is mentioned in the section on adaptation benefits, please consider elaborating on this topic in this section and whether a conflict analysis has been undertaken.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/13/2018 - Cleared. The agency has briefly provided additional information showing that information gathered on agriculture, livestock and fisheries in the 15 target regions will make it possible to adjust the production paths of primary food crops (millet, sorghum, maize), avoiding expected production reductions estimated between -10 and -25 percent, while supporting better</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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 in the PIF.</p>	<p>decision-making processes overall.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 1/9/2017 - Update requested. While the Agency has indicated in the answers to comments from the US Council members that CBOs and NGOs have been engaged in project design and preparation, it would be helpful to summarize this information in A.3 Stakeholders, so as to have a record of this in the proposal itself, and not just in the Annex. Additionally, in Section A.5 on Risks, Indigenous Peoples are mentioned, but this is not indicated in Section A.3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly elaborate in Section A.3 how CBOs and NGOs were engaged in the project design phase and continue to be engaged in the implementation phase (as per the response to the comments from the US Council Member in Annex B. - "During the implementation phase, NGOs & CBOs will be part of the technical committee, and will be given the opportunity to participate in decision-making. NGOs will act as an interface between the ministerial actors and the communities. Their role will be fundamental in products 2.1 on training programmes (5 NGOs will receive training on CCA mainstreaming – output 2.1.), on identifying adaptation options (output 2.2), and on updating sectoral and regional plans policies.")</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>GEFSEC, 2/13/2018 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that the role of Indigenous people will be a function of the adaptation options selected under activity 2.2.3 "Identify and prioritize adaptation options". If indigenous people are present in the targeted areas, the project team and consultants will ensure their engagement and the alignment with UNDP's principles on indigenous people. Regarding CBOs/NGOs, the agency has included the information requested on NGO/CBO engagement from the responses given to comments from Council members in Section A.3.</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 could further assess risks and mitigation measures associated with the sustainability of the proposed investments in hydro-meteorological observation under Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe risks and mitigation measures associated with the sustainability of the proposed investments in hydro-meteorological observation under Component 1.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- YES. The initial risk assessment has been strengthened as recommended.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/9/2017 - Yes. The risk matrix is sufficiently developed.</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Relevant projects have been identified, with which coordination will be sought.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/9/2017 - Update requested. It seems The Emergency Agricultural Production Support Project (EAPSP) project closed in 2017. There is also a</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>new LDCF-financed project under preparation - Community-based climate risks management in Chad, also being implemented by UNDP. Additionally, there are two proposals currently in the pipeline from AfDB - Strengthening rural and urban resilience to climate change and variability by the provision of water supply and sanitation in Chad; and FAO - Strengthening agro-ecosystems' adaptive capacity to climate change in the Lake Chad Basin (Lac, Kanem, Bahr El Ghazal, and part of the Hadjer-Lamis region).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please indicate whether the proposed project will coordinate with the new LDCF-financed UNDP project under preparation and whether the project team is aware of the two projects in the pipeline; and confirm whether the EAPSP has in fact closed.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/14/2018 - Cleared. The EAPSP project has been removed as a baseline and the agency has confirmed that it is well aware of the other two LDCF-financed projects in the pipeline, as well as the one under preparation; and is in contact with the project teams of all three.</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, 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8 and 11, please revisit the</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/10/2018 - Yes. The proposed project supports Chad in adopting a comprehensive approach to the NAP process, addressing critical information and capacity needs across relevant sectors at various levels.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>description of the project's innovative aspects, sustainability strategy and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>The proposed project would adopt a comprehensive approach to advancing Chad's national adaptation plan process; addressing critical information and capacity needs across all climate-sensitive sectors, from the national to the sub-national levels. The project would enhance existing policy-making and planning processes, as well as the underlying climate information services, thereby seeking a sustained improvement in Chad's ability to address the adverse effects of climate change in the context of its national development priorities.</p>	<p>Proposed activities will enhance existing policy-making and planning processes, as well as the underlying climate information services, supporting Chad in developing its' ability to address the adverse effects of climate change in the context of its national development priorities.</p> <p>Chad's NAP will be the framework for adaptation, and will guide the country's medium- and long-term adaptation planning, providing a framework for guidance for future endeavors. Scaling up will be facilitated through the integration of adaptation into the political agenda and through strengthening the expertise of officials in relevant ministries. Project tools and technologies can also be used to integrate adaptation into sectors and regions beyond those targeted in this proposal.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>1/15/2017 - More information requested. There does not seem to be any articulation of changes described in Section A of Part II - "describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF"; although there seem to be at the minimum, some minor changes in comparison to the PIF, in relation to allocation of financing listed in Tables A and B, and in other areas of the proposal.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly describe all substantive changes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>to the what was presented in the PIF proposal, accompanied by clear justifications of the changes in Section A of Part II of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/14/2018 -Cleared. The agency has clarified that changes to the project design have been added to the the section "Expected outcomes and components." These changes include a reduction of the geographical scope of the project for outcome 1 and the sub-national activities under outcome 2. Additionally, more resources were allocated toward outcome 1 from US\$3,000,000 to US\$3,263,000 due to information gathered during PPG.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENT: Please confirm that these are all the changes since PIF stage approval. Additionally, it would be appreciated if the agency could aggregate all the changes from the different sections in the review sheet and succinctly present them in Section A of Part II, where the template asks that any changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF are described.</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>GEFSEC, 1/9/2017 - Not quite. There is no information provided regarding how the activities chosen are more cost-effective than feasible alternatives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly explain how the proposed</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>activities are cost-effective in comparison with viable alternatives.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/14/2018 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that there is information on cost effectiveness available in the project document, and indicated that the geographic and sectoral scope(s) of the project were more cost effective than any proposed alternatives.</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 refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p>	<p>1/15/2018 - Clarification requested. The co-financing figures have changed from PIF stage, without any explanation or justification as to what has changed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly clarify any changes (refer to Item 14) made to the proposal since PIF submission.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 2/14/2018 - Cleared. The co-financing from the GCCA project and the HydroMet project were both identified during the initiation workshop and are supplementary to what was initially identified at PIF. Additional co-financing commitments were also received from the government.</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>YES. At \$18 million, the indicative co-financing amount is adequate, as is UNDP's share of the indicative co-financing at \$1.5 million.</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 1/15/2018 - Yes. The co-financing indicated in Table C is adequate and co-financing letters are included in the endorsement package, but please refer to Item 6.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$275,000, or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	9/15/2018 - Yes. As at PIF.
	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 \$150,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to \$6 million.	1/15/2018 - Yes. A table detailing PPG activities is included in Annex C.
	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?		GEFSEC, 1/9/2018 - Yes. Tracking tool is included with information on indicators 5, 6,9,12,13.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		GEFSEC, 1/15/2018 - Yes. A budgeted M&E plan is included as part of section C.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		1/15/2018 - Please indicate whether comments were received by STAP.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		1/15/2017 - Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 16.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		11/08/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 13 and 16. 11/30/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		1/15/2018 - Not at this time. Please address Items 6,7,9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 23 and resubmit. 2/14/2018 - The endorsement request will be recommended for approval after the agency addresses Item 14.
	First review*	September 11, 2014	January 15, 2018
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 08, 2014	February 14, 2018
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 30, 2014	

* **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.**