



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

GEF ID:	4536		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Climate Resilient Coastal Protection and Management		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,818,182
Co-financing:	\$54,334,000	Total Project Cost:	\$56,152,182
PIF Approval:	September 19, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 10, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Arnaud Cauchois

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, India is a non-annex I party to the UNFCCC.	Yes. See comments at PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An OFP endorsement letter dated May3, 2011 is attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. The ADB has comparative advantage to implement the proposed project because of its experience in infrastructure investment projects.	Yes. See comments at PIF.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project fits into the country partnership strategy of ADB for India, which emphasizes sustainable measures for coastal protection with focus on the enhanced capacity of state authorities.	Yes. See comments at PIF.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	N/A
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes. The requested grant is within the resources available from the SCCF-Adaptation window.	Yes, the requested resources remain available from the SCCF Adaptation window.
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>No. Sufficient information is not provided. Table A (SCCF Results Framework) does not indicate the project components that address different objectives or outcomes.</p> <p>Recommended Action: In table A (SCCF Framework) please indicate the project components that contribute towards different outcomes.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Satisfactory changes have been made.</p>	<p>Not yet clear. While the project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2 of the SCCF Framework, please include in document, more justification to why CCA-3 (Technology Transfer) was no longer appropriate for project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide justification for the removal of CCA-3.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Yes, the Agency has provided sufficient justification for the removal of objective CCA-3. The baseline project itself will incorporate shoreline protection technologies that will be designed in a climate-resilient way. Therefore LDCF resources do not need to be allocated for</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Not clearly. The PIF states that it will contribute to all the 3 LDCF/SCCF objectives, and outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2; however the project components that do so are not identified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please specify which project components address the above-mentioned SCCF objectives.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Satisfactory changes have been made.</p>	<p>this activity.</p> <p>Yes, the project identifies the relevant SCCF objectives and components.</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>No. More detailed description is required to ascertain the consistency of the project with respect to the country's priorities under different conventions. The description clarifies that climate change issues are a priority in the country's agenda, however the position of the project in relation to the agenda is unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide relevancy of the project not only with the NAPCC but also with National Communications. Description about contribution of the project to the National Water Mission is needed. Please provide the references for State Action Plans on Climate Change and describe in which capacity the proposed project supports the Action. Please revise the section to illustrate project</p>	<p>Yes, a comprehensive assessment of the project's compliance with national policies and plans is outlined in section A.2. The project will also support objectives identified in the Climate Change Action Plans (National and State), aimed at developing capacity for hydro-meteorological and hydrological monitoring of climate change impacts on coastal systems.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>alignment at national and also at state level (especially the two mentioned states) and the ways the project contributes to needs and knowledge gaps identified in various communications.</p> <p>9/12/2011 The provided information shows that the project is consistent with the country's National Communication, National Action Plan of Climate Change, National Water Mission, and Government of India's Five Year National Plan and National Coastal Protection Project.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. Component 3 incorporates strengthening institutional capacities at state and national level.	Yes, the project aims to strengthen capacity for climate resilient shoreline planning and development at both national and local levels (component 4), through trainings and awareness raising activities.
Project Design	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>No. From the description of the baseline presented in section B.1 it is difficult to determine the activities that would be conducted solely in the baseline project. The section has too much generalized information regarding climate change impacts in the coastal area, and fails to clearly identify and describe the baseline project. The earlier paragraphs add ambiguity regarding the efforts to be taken in the baseline project versus the initiatives targeted for the SCCF funds.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please describe only the activities</p>	<p>Not yet clear. While the project is supported through a three tranche program of ADB investments, it is unclear to what extent the three tranches contribute to the baseline project outputs described in section B.1.3.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is indicative from the document that the SCCF project co-financing will be supported through Tranche 1; and as such, outputs from activities implemented Tranche 1 activities need to be more clearly described, including specific descriptions to how these activities will contribute to the SCCF project</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>related to the baseline project ADB SCPMIP in this section, and revise the description to remove any ambiguity regarding the baseline project activities and the activities for which SCCF funds are sought. Please describe as clearly and succinctly as possible the measures that the SCPMIP takes in terms of coastal management, and provide sound reasons or references to additional information that supports such measures. Identify all the states involved in the SCPMIP, the description states that there are 3 target States but only Maharashtra and Karnataka are identified. The reasons behind choosing these States for the additional adaptation efforts need to be presented.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Provided information is sufficient. Both in Karnakata and Maharastra coastal erosion has been cited as a major issue. This threatens the existing infrastructure in the coastal areas. Climate change induced sea level rise and increased frequency of typhoons are predicted to worsen this threat. It is also stated that in Karnataka, beaches could be developed into tourism or residential areas.</p> <p>ADB funded Sustainable Coastal Protection and Management Investment Program (SCPMIP) will form the baseline for the proposed SCCF project. The baseline project will develop</p>	<p>components, in alignment with project framework table B.</p> <p>Recommended Action: 1) Please provide more detailed description on activities/milestones to be completed across the three baseline project Tranches, and 2) indicate alignment of Tranche 1 activities with project components identified.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2104: Yes, the Agency has provided an indication of funding amounts, timelines and associated activities for the three tranches of baseline funding, which will support coastal management activities in the states of Karnataka and Maharashtra. Tranche 1 will provide the base for planning and capacity building activities of the SCCF project. Tranches 2 and 3 will support coastal protection investment activities for which climate-resilient design will be introduced through SCCF funded activities.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sustainable plans and management for shorelines, reduce coastal erosion and enhance capacity for shoreline planning and development.	
	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>Not yet clear. While the project supports numerous ongoing initiatives at the national and local level, providing significant opportunities for scaling up, a more comprehensive cost-comparison with alternative approaches can be provided in section B.7.</p> <p>Recommended Action: please provide a more comprehensive cost-assessment, including comparison with alternative scenarios.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2104: The Agency has provided adequate explanation for why information on cost-effectiveness cannot be provided at this stage. Studies to determine cost-effective design will be undertaken among Tranch 1 activities.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>No. The distinction between the activities performed under the baseline project ADB SCPMIP and those proposed in the PIF are unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please revise sections B.1 and B.2 to include only the baseline and the project (PIF proposed) activities respectively. Please clarify whether inclusion of both the hard and soft infrastructure measures are already included in the baseline project activities. If they are (as expressed in</p>	<p>Not yet clear. See comments in 11.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address comments in 11, providing clear descriptions of activities to be completed across the three tranches; and more specifically, how activities in Tranche 1 link to the SCCF project components.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2104: Yes. While the baseline project seeks to improve coastal management, the SCCF</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the SCPMIP project document), then please explain what the proposal means by "use of ecosystem-based coastal adaptation." As written currently the baseline project description is ambiguous regarding the coastal infrastructure and management planning the SCPMIP encompasses. Please revise the description such that it is clear i) the activities under the SCPMIP project ii) climate vulnerabilities the SCPMIP project does not address iii) in section B.2 clarify how the SCPMIP projects are linked to making coastal areas resilient to climate change at a national scale and the need for it.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Not entirely clear. SCCF funding will be used to i) mainstream climate resilience in coastal management at all levels ii) perform site based vulnerability assessments and application of environmentally sustainable approaches iii) disseminate relevant adaptation knowledge. These activities would not have been performed in the baseline project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Especially because it is stated that there is a potential to develop the shorelines of Karnataka for tourism and residential purposes, it is requested to verify that the vulnerability assessments will be used to consider whether or not to initiate such developments, and to assist</p>	<p>components will support the integration of climate change considerations in the baseline activities. This will be done through measures such as: inclusion of climate change parameters in coastal information systems; technical and economic analyses for climate-resilient shoreline investment design; pilot projects in community-managed natural protection measures such as dune zoning, fencing, use of geotextile bags inside dunes for protection, maintaining the openings of small river outlets, etc.; inclusion of climate change considerations in training programs, and training of trainers, at the National Water Academy.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in making such potential developments climate resilient.</p> <p>9/14/2011 Provided clarification is satisfactory.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>No. The project framework, built around 3 components, fails to address the project objective "to strengthen the resilience of coastal ecosystems and communities to the adverse impacts of climate change by creating conducive institutional policy and practice frameworks for mainstreaming climate change considerations into coastal protection and shoreline management." The framework does not establish strong links between the baseline project SCPMIP, the additional efforts to be undertaken through SCCF, and outcomes aimed at to achieve the project objective.</p> <p>Project Component 1: The expected outputs are not concrete and seem to have been addressed through national level efforts such as the National Communications. The outputs are geared towards knowledge management and it is unclear how this will directly result in the targeted outcome of "coastal areas managed to mitigate erosion and long term climate change issues."</p> <p>Project Component 2: The expected outputs such as vulnerability assessments (2.1) and cost-benefits</p>	<p>Not yet clear. See comments in 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address comments in 11 and 13, and provide a clear indication of how activities in Tranche 1 link to the SCCF project components and co-financing amounts provided in project framework Table B.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Yes. The SCCF project will support shoreline management plans, coastal information systems, climate-resilient infrastructure, strengthening of community organizations, and training hubs. While INV components comprise a lower proportion than preferred by the GEF (in this case, 35% of the SCCF grant), this balance is justified by the fact that the project will support a range of necessary associated measures for adaptation, i.e., improved coastal information systems and studies to inform climate-resilient planning and design.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>analysis do not provide expected concrete climate change related benefits as desired through SCCF funds. The project objective clearly highlights coastal communities, however the expected outputs fail to clearly indicate how the communities will directly benefit.</p> <p>Project Component 3: The description related to the project component is satisfactory.</p> <p>Recommended Action: The project framework needs to be revised to reflect its consistency with the "Adaptation to Climate Change (LDCF/SCCF) Results Framework" (GEF 5 Template Reference Guide - Sept. 2010). Special attention needs to be given to make expected outputs mainly for components 1 and 2 more concrete so that they directly address climate change risks. Please clarify what participation in management of coastal structures (Output 2.4) will entail such that it will enhance livelihood opportunities. Expected output 2.5 need to specify which region or pilot initiative it is referring to.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Not entirely clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please separate component 2 into two distinct components, one that is TA and one that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>is INV. As sections B1 and B2 emphasize soft measures, please provide more information on "hard adaptation measures" referenced currently under component 2 of Table B (Project Framework).</p> <p>9/14/2011 Requested changes have been made and the provided clarifications are satisfactory</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>No. Following the lack of information and clarity regarding the shortcomings of the baseline project, necessity of national level management plans, and the rationale behind host of activities proposed for the SCCF funds it is not possible to determine the appropriateness of the methodology and assumptions.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please see comments for 14 and 15.</p> <p>9/12/2011 The applied methodology of performing vulnerability assessments, incorporating resiliency into planning and infrastructure and improving institutional capacities at all levels for climate change resilience seems sound.</p>	<p>Not yet clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address comments in 11, 13, and 14.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Yes. All related comments have been addressed.</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>No. The socioeconomic benefits explained are speculative and not well explained.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please explain direct and tangible socio-economic benefits that the project will deliver in the targeted states and at the national level.</p> <p>9/12/2011 Benefits to the urban and rural households in the coastal areas have been mentioned. The project will have a positive impact on tourism and fishery industries as well. The project will promote community participation and income generating opportunities with special focus on women.</p>	<p>Yes, a clear description of the socio-economic benefits is provided. Specifically, the project will 1) improve livelihoods of vulnerable shoreline communities (especially for women), 2) support tourism, farming and fishing industries, and 3) support community engagement and participation in shoreline protection and management.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>No. The issue of local livelihood is mentioned but not adequately addressed in component 2. The measures that will be undertaken to develop opportunities for increased community participation needs to be identified. The proposal states engagement with local planning levels and community groups, however it is identity of these groups and the proposed activities are unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify the identity and role of community groups and local population in the proposed project. The statements like "including some gender benefits," need to be more specific and descriptive.</p>	<p>Yes, the project comprehensively identifies the roles several stakeholders in section B.6.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>9/12/2011 Yes. The project includes public participation at preparation and implementation phase.</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 resilience)</p>	<p>No. The PIF identifies main risks to the project as the lack of cooperativeness between MoWR and MoEF. It is understood that MoEF is executing a complimentary ICZM project in the Northern states. But, its role in the proposed project has not been explained. The projects are being implemented in two states, however State level government entities involved have not been identified. In terms of mainstreaming adaptation at country level, it would be important to understand the relation between the national and the state level entities as well.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please describe the role of MoEF in the proposed project. Please identify the state level parties engaged in the project and their relations with the national level governmental entities involved in the project.</p> <p>9/12/2011 The provided information regarding MoEF and state level parties is sufficient for the PIF stage. More defined roles and related information is expected at the CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>Yes, the project takes into account risks (medium and high), including adequate mitigation measures.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The PIF includes satisfactory description of other related initiatives. The project will be based on the baseline ADB project, SCPMIP and will also benefit from experiences of the World Bank funded Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in the northern States.	<p>Not yet clear. While the project identifies linkages with the baseline project (SCPMIP), more information can be provided on coordination with other external initiatives.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide more information on coordination with other external initiatives.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Yes. The project will coordinate with various coastal research and investment studies and projects that are underway in India, including: Sustainable Coastal Protection and Management Investment Program (ADB); Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project (WB); coastal zone research in India being undertaken by the National Institute of Oceanography and other organizations; and coastal elements of various State Action Plans.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Not yet clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please include justification of removing CCA-3 from project framework.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Yes, this has been addressed. Please see 2/20/2014 comment for Item 7, above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The proposed management costs are \$ 120,000, which is 7% of the requested SCCF grant. A full account of management expenses will be required by CEO endorsement.	Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>No. The majority of the requested SCCF funding will go towards component 2: building resilient coastal protection infrastructure. However, activities to be undertaken are still unclear and duplication of efforts regarding inclusion of soft measures in the infrastructure needs, and vulnerability assessments need to be clarified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please see comment 14 and also fill table D (page 5)</p> <p>9/12/2011 Yes. Over 40% of the SCCF grant will be directed towards concrete investment activities.</p>	<p>Not yet clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address comments in 11, 13, and 14.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014 Yes. Items 11, 13 and 14 have been satisfactorily addressed.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Indicative co-financing is from ADB (USD 37,681,000), State of Maharashtra (USD 4,800,000) and State of Karnataka (USD 12,200,000). The level and nature of the proposed co-financing is appropriate and satisfactory.	<p>Not yet clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address comments in 11, 13, and 14.</p> <p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: Not clear. Items 11, 13 and 14 have been satisfactorily addressed. However, the co-financing letters do not specify amounts.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Recommended action, FI 2/20/2014: Please provide letters from the States of Karnataka and Maharashtra specifying in-kind co-financing of \$4.933 M and \$2.806 M, respectively, as well as indication of the nature of the in-kind contributions.</p> <p>Update, FI 3/3/2014: Agency has been asked to submit a letter stating that the SCCF project will support adaptation measures to \$46.595 M of baseline co-financing.</p> <p>Update, FI 3/12/2014: Yes. The Agency has submitted a letter stating that the SCCF project will support the integration of adaptation measures in \$46.595 of baseline co-financing being provided by ADB and \$7.739 million of in-kind co-financing from the States of Maharashtra and Karnataka.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. The co-financing amount of over \$ 37 million that ADB is bringing to the project is in line with its leading role in the project.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat?	N/A	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	N/A	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No. PIF needs to be revised to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -clearly align the proposed activities with the expected outcomes in the "LDCF/SCCF adaptation to climate change framework," -differentiate between actions to be taken under the baseline project and the proposed project, -focus and expand on concrete actions, -clarify the State level actions and the national level actions and the process of linking them. <p>9/12/2011 A number of concerns need to be addressed before the PIF clearance can be approved. Please see sections 13 and 14.</p> <p>9/14/2011 Yes. All the concerns have been adequately addressed.</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?		N/A
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		No. Please address comments in 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19 and 21.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Update, FI 2/20/2014: No. Please provide co-financing letters that specify in-kind contributions (financing amount and type of contribution), as requested in Item 25.</p> <p>Update 3/3/14: Not yet. The Agency has been asked to submit a letter stating that the SCCF project will support integration of adaptation measures in \$46.595 of baseline co-financing being provided by ADB.</p> <p>FI 3/12/2014: Yes.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 23, 2011	August 13, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 12, 2011	February 20, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 14, 2011	March 12, 2014
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	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.