



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

GEF ID:	5105		
Country/Region:	Tunisia		
Project Title:	Addressing Climate Change Vulnerabilities and Risks in Vulnerable Coastal Areas of Tunisia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4697 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,500,000
Co-financing:	\$73,930,000	Total Project Cost:	\$79,530,000
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Ken Chachibaia

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, Tunisia is a non-annex I party to the UNFCCC.	YES. Tunisia is a non-Annex I Party to the UNFCCC.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An OFP endorsement letter dated August 17, 2012 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 UNDP has a comparative advantage in integrated policy development, capacity building and institutional strengthening. The UNDP is also a strategic partner of the Ministry of Environment and Coastal Protection and Planning Agency (APAL).	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)
	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. The project is aligned with UNDP's strategy for Tunisia, which aims to strengthen public institutions, civil society and public sector. The size and the capacity of the country team seem adequate for the project operations.	YES. No change from PIF.
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 requested grant is within the resources available from the SCCF-Adaptation window.	YES. No change from PIF.
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives.	NOT CLEAR. According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), the proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, outcomes 1.1, 2.2 and 3.1. Under Outcome 2.2, however, the framework cites output 1.2.1. Outcome 2.2 is also

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>phrased differently from the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review the Focal Area Strategy Framework and ensure that it is consistent with the language and results chain of the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool. Specifically, consider replacing Objective CCA-2 and Outcome 2.1 with Objective CCA-1 and Outcome 1.2.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended.</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 proposes to address risks related to sea level rise and coastal development, which have been identified as top priority in the National Communications of Tunisia. National Development plan also highlights the need to integrate climate change effects into land and water management.</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project is line with the findings of the vulnerability assessments carried out as part of Tunisia's Initial and Second National Communications. The risk of sea-level rise is also prominently featured as a priority issue in the 12th National Development Plan (2012-14) and the National Development Strategy (2012-16).</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. The proposed project would enhance institutional and technical capacities, regulatory and policy frameworks, and explore sustainable public and private financing for sustained, integrated and climate-resilient coastal-zone management.</p>
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and</p>	<p>Yes. Coastal areas in Tunisia are rich in natural resources, consist of economically important infrastructure and provide access to external markets.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on a substantial baseline of coastal protection and coastal-zone management initiatives, including: (i)</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Increasing population pressure in already densely populated coastal areas and expanding industries along the coastline are stated to be baseline issues.</p> <p>Sea level rise(SLR), unpredictability in rainfall and salinization are stated as the most important climate change risks. These climate risks are exacerbated by coastal erosion and shoreline retreat induced by human disturbances.</p> <p>"National Programme for Coastal Erosion Protection" forms the baseline of the proposed LDCF project. The baseline project aims to implement hard engineering measures to protect 14 highly vulnerable tourism beaches.</p>	<p>development work in the coastal zone of the Monastir Bay; (ii) protection work off the cliffs at Monastir Bay; (iii) Extension and rehabilitation works at the Chebba fishing port; (iv) KfW Coastal Protection; (v) the Energy Environment Programme; and (vi) the Coastal Protection from Carthage to Gammarth Programme.</p> <p>While each baseline initiative is clearly described, it is not entirely clear how the sources, types and amounts of financing associated with each initiative relate to Table C on confirmed co-financing. APAL does not seem to be the only source of co-financing, and most co-financing seems to be other than in-kind.</p> <p>It is also not clear whether any of the baseline initiatives that invest in tangible, coastal protection measures ([i], [ii], [iii], [iv] and [vi] above) operate in the two pilot areas; Northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis and Northeast coast of the Island of Djerba; and whether and how, as a result, these investments would be strengthened through the proposed, SCCF-financed adaptation measures.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) ensure that the sources, types and amounts of confirmed co-financing reflect the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build; and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>(ii) clarify whether any of the baseline initiatives that invest in tangible, coastal protection measures operate in the two pilot areas.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies the geographical location of baseline investments.</p> <p>Table 1 on p. 9-12 of the Request for CEO Endorsement provides a detailed account of sources, types and amounts of co-financing. This is very welcome, and should be accurately and consistently reflected in Table C.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Table C is consistent with Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement in terms of sources, types and amounts of co-financing.</p> <p>07/22/2014 -- YES. Table C has been revised as recommended.</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 11, 13 and 15. It is unclear to what extent the proposed project would take advantage of opportunities to strengthen and complement existing and planned investments in coastal protection rather than implement pilots in areas that are not covered by these baseline investments; and what the associated implications would be in terms of cost-effectiveness.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13 and 15, please revisit the description of cost effectiveness, if necessary.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p> <p>07/22/2014 -- YES.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes. The focus of the baseline project is solely on hard engineering solutions against coastal erosion. However, for a long term solution for coastal protection integration of climate change projections and consideration of all suitable measures is necessary.</p> <p>The proposed project will develop a) conditions suitable to support proactive management of climate risks b) expertise and knowledge necessary for risk assessment and decision making c) technical capacity for long term climate solutions d) financial incentive that support adaptation measures</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>While the Request for CEO Endorsement notes that existing coastal protection investments fail to address coastal erosion and sea-level rise in an integrated manner, it is not clear whether and how the proposed project and, specifically, the pilot measures in the Northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis and Northeast coast of the Island of Djerba would enhance the design and implementation of the baseline initiatives that have invested or are investing in tangible coastal protection measures, notably KfW's Coastal Protection Programme; development work in the coastal zone of Monastir Bay; and Coastal Protection from Carthage to Gammarth. According to paragraph 83 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, the interface between the proposed SCCF project and these baseline investments would have mainly to do with drawing lessons, which is different from addressing the additional</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>cost of adaptation to these investments.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11 above, please clarify how the proposed project, and particularly the pilot measures in the Northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis and Northeast coast of the Island of Djerba, would enhance the design and implementation of the baseline initiatives that invest in tangible coastal protection measures.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement confirms that the pilot measures proposed for SCCF financing would have a limited, direct impact on the ongoing, tangible investments in coastal protection. Instead, the SCCF grant would contribute towards these initiatives by enhancing the capacities of APAL. In certain cases, however, baseline investments are already underway and are scheduled to be completed in 2014-2015. It is not clear whether and how the proposed project would have an impact on the design of these initiatives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Further to the additional information provided on the timing and geographical focus of the baseline initiatives, please review the list of baseline investments with a view to identifying those initiatives that would be directly impacted by the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>proposed SCCF grant, and those that should perhaps rather be considered among other relevant initiatives, with which coordination and complementarity will be sought.</p> <p>07/22/2014 -- YES. The list of baseline initiatives has been revised as recommended.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is composed of three complimentary components namely,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Enabling policy and institutional frameworks -Implementation of adaptation measures -Provision of economic incentives <p>The expected outputs and outcomes are appropriate.</p>	<p>YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear. Please refer, however, to Section 24 below.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. The applied methodology is appropriate to determine adaptation benefits of the project.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 12 and 13 above.</p> <p>The baselines and targets associated with the two objective-level indicators are not entirely clear. For indicator 1, the baseline is defined as "limited domestic financing mechanisms" and a target of \$10 million is set. Yet it is noted that there is an existing coastal adaptation budget of \$16 million per year. This is already eight times the target of \$10 million at the end of the 5-year project.</p> <p>As for indicator 2, it is unclear how many coastal hotels are considered, and how many of those are counted among the "few" that employ soft protection</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>measures in the baseline situation.</p> <p>Finally, with respect to Outcome 2, it would be helpful to see an outcome indicator that captures the number of people at risk in the baseline situation (share of whom are women), and the number of people whose exposure would be reduced as a result of the proposed project. The project results framework cites a total population of 150,000 people, but there does not seem to be a clear indicator associated with this number.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13 above, (i) please clarify the baselines and targets associated with the two objective-level indicators, and (ii) consider including an outcome indicator that captures the number of people at risk in the baseline situation (share of whom are women), and the number of people whose exposure would be reduced as a result of the proposed project.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- YES. The project results framework; including relevant indicators, baselines and targets; has been specified as recommended.</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</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. The project focuses on highly populated and economically vital coastal areas in Tunisia. In order to make necessary adjustments in existing coastal policies and practices,</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The socio-economic benefits are adequately described, but the gender dimensions should be better articulated in Section B.2 of the Request for CEO Endorsement. For instance, this</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	<p>government institutions, private sector and populations will be provided with necessary assistance. At least 150,000 coastal inhabitants will benefit from the project. However role of the communities and specifically, role of women in the targeted private and public sectors is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO endorsement: Please provide information on the project aspects that will specifically address needs of vulnerable groups especially women. Also provide information on community involvement in the project.</p>	<p>section does not capture the response provided to previous comments in Annex B.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe further the gender dimensions of the proposed project.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- YES. Gender dimensions have been clarified in the revised Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Involvement of national level institutions and their roles are clear. However, the role of the communities and organizations in different project components and their level of engagement is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on roles the local communities and organizations have in the project components.</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including CSOs, has been adequately considered.</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>Yes for PIF stage. Insufficient institutional engagement and resistance among stakeholders are stated as main risks and appropriate mitigation measures for the PIF stage is given.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement:</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement identifies relevant risks and mitigation measures.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Please investigate risks associated in achieving adequate community involvement, conducting cost benefit analysis and proof of viability of alternative measures of coastal protection.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes for PIF stage. The proposal outlines in detail coordination with another UNDP project on coastal development.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please provide similar details on collaboration opportunities with other agencies and NGOs activities indentified in the proposal.</p>	YES. Coordination and complementarity with other relevant initiatives has been adequately considered in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>Not Clear. Role of Ministry of Environment and Coastal Planning and Protection Agency as the Executing Agency is understood. However, identity and roles of other executing bodies is unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please identify and provide information on roles of different executing partners.</p> <p>9/21/2012 JS Yes. Various executing partners have been identified and their roles are described. It is suggested to clearly identify the institution/s who would implement component 2 of the project.</p>	YES.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.

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?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Requested PMC is appropriate.	YES. At \$250,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes for PIF stage.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11, 13 and 25.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13 and 25, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component, if necessary.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 25.</p> <p>07/22/2014 -- YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The National Government, multilateral agency (KfW) and UNDP are providing co-financing for the proposed project. The total estimated co-financing is \$54.1 million.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. The description of the baseline scenario and the associated sources, types and amounts of financing is not clearly consistent with the sources, types and amounts of co-financing cited in Table C of the Request for CEO Endorsement. Moreover, while APAL's confirmation of the KfW and EU co-financing is appreciated; it would seem equally important that these amounts are confirmed by the agencies that provide the co-financing through their projects

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>and programs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) ensure that all sources, types and amounts of co-financing are consistently reported in the Request for CEO Endorsement; and (ii) seek, where applicable, additional confirmation from the relevant sources of co-financing.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>07/22/2014 -- 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. The UNDP is bringing \$120,000 to the project. The agency co-financing is not reflective of its leading role in the project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide additional avenues of UNDP's contribution towards the project.</p> <p>9/21/2012 JS It is indicated that more resources will be contributed through the UNDP towards the project. Total of \$1.165M will be contributed.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. UNDP's co-financing towards the proposed project has been brought down from \$1.165 million to \$100,000. The change is not clearly explained.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify why UNDP's confirmed co-financing towards the proposed project is less than 10 per cent of the amount indicated at PIF.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement explains the change in co-financing from UNDP.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>NO.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please complete and submit the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool with</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>baselines and targets for relevant indicators corresponding to the CCA objectives towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute.</p> <p>06/12/2014 -- YES.</p>
	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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		YES.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this stage. Please provide adequate responses for 20 and 26.</p> <p>9/21/2012 JS Yes. Responses provided for sections 20 and 26 are sufficient and clear.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Comments for sections 16, 17, 18, 19 and 29.	
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?		<p>NOT CLEAR. It seems that merely 25 per cent of the PPG had been spent at the time of submission and that only 29 per cent had been committed for the remainder of 2014. It is not clear whether any of the remaining funds have been committed beyond that.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify briefly the status of the PPG.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			06/12/2014 -- YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 32. 06/12/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 12, 13, 24 and 25. 07/22/2014 -- YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 11, 2012	May 01, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 21, 2012	June 12, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 22, 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?	Not clear. The proposed preparation activities are appropriate. The preparation activities build on vulnerability assessments completed by AAP and will focus on targeted analysis for the project. Resources will be targeted to determine risks that existing infrastructure face and design measures that need to be integrated in the planning developments to avert climate risks. Stakeholders and their roles in the project will be consulted thoroughly. However it is not clear if the PPG will be used to produce a project baseline indicators and results framework as suggested in AMAT. Recommended Action: Please clarify the use of GEF proposed the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). 9/21/2012 JS

		As a part of the baseline studies AMAT indicators will be selected.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget is justified and consultant rates (Local and international) are appropriate.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see section 1. 9/21/2012 Yes
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 11, 2012
	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.