



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

GEF ID:	<b>4452</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Standardized Methodologies for Carbon Accounting and Ecosystem Services Valuation of Blue Forests</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>International Waters</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>IW-3; Others; Project Mana; IW-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,500,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$18,590,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$23,090,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 19, 2011</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2011</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Andrew Hume</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Isabelle Van der Beck</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	[AH:2/7/11] NA	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	[AH:2/7/11] Global, No letters of endorsement needed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	[AH:2/7/11] Yes. UNEP already has a strong blue forest baseline, including the Blue Carbon Initiative and two key publications on the topic. UNEP is also instrumental at bridging science and policy with platforms like the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	[AH:2/7/11] NA	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	[AH:2/7/11] Global project. Addressed.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	[AH:2/7/11] Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Blue forests have been identified as a GEF 5 priority under the IW focal area Objective 3. However, PIF is very focused on C sequestration methodology for financial mechanisms more suitable with the CC focal area. To make project more in line with IW strategy, please consider other ecosystem services as financial incentives for protection of coastal and marine habitats.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Revised PIR now considers broader ecosystem services in addition to C sequestration.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Outcome 3 mentions "research and peer-reviewed literature" -</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to be more in line with the Focal Area strategy this should read targeted research.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	[AH:2/7/11] NA	
	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>[AH:2/7/11] Addressed for C sequestration. Global international standards, framework, methodology and financing mechanisms.</p> <p>[AH 2/10/11] Please address for other ecosystem services.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] No. Issue of institutional sustainability not addressed clearly in PIF.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	
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>[AH:2/7/11] The baseline investments need further explanation. Please elaborate on the Blue Carbon Initiative's role and the current synthesis it has produced. Also explain role Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services plays into the project's baseline.</p> <p>[AH 2/10/11] Please elaborate on baseline projects of other ecosystem service valuation.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. However, at</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>time of CEO Endorsement please note that ecosystem services baseline is still weak relative to C sequestration. Please elaborate on ecosystem services baseline projects like payment for ecosystem services (PES) progress made by Forest Trend's Marine Katoomba meetings and TNC's marine conservation agreements (MCAs).</p> <p>[AH:3/28/11] Addressed.</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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Yes. Incremental GEF activities will serve as much needed catalyst for mainstreaming blue forest services into conservation management.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Project's expected outcomes are not quantitative enough, especially for components 1, 2, and 4. Please be more specific and identify tangible outputs for each expected outcome.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed, however there are still a few issues that need to be addressed at CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>(i) Component 2 - Expected Output 1: Please specify the number of small-scale interventions that will focus on C sequestration versus ecosystem valuation.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(ii) Component 2 - Expected Output 2: As of now there could potentially be only two meetings over two years per working group would be held to "reach consensus for best practice..." - will two meetings will be sufficient to reach this output?</p> <p>(iii) Component 3 - Expected Output 3: While I recognize it is impossible to identify scope of research papers at PIF stage, it would be reassuring to know that there is equal attention given to both C sequestration and ecosystem services valuation. It would be to the project's detriment if all six papers only focused on one aspect or another.</p> <p>(iv) Component 4 - Expected Output 1: Wording is very similar to Output 1.2. Are these outputs meant to produce the same methodologies or different? Output 1.2 suggests methodologies for 3 ecosystems by project's 3rd year, while Output 4.1 suggests methodologies for 2 ecosystems by project's 4th year. Please make more consistent and clarify if these are intended to be different Outputs and adjust requested funding if they are the same.</p> <p>[AH:3/28/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Output 2.1 - It is not clear what the actual outputs will be from the small-scale interventions. The only verb</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in this output is applying the new methodologies. There should really be a more substantial result from this application like reports, evaluations, etc. This is likely the what the second output of this component is meant to do but it is not clear in the text.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] PIF methodology adequately presents plan to catalyze mainstream blue carbon in the international policy and financial arenas. However, it is important that ecosystem services other than C sequestration are accounted for when making valuation methodology.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] No. section needs to reflect the impact of this proposed project, not just general climate change socio-economic benefits. Please consider both immediate and long-term socio-economic impacts of project at regional and local levels, especially in developing economies.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11]: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Please expand this topic. It is unclear if this project is taking any further steps other than recognizing baseline activities.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11]: Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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)	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Yes, although no risks identified is higher than medium risk. Please reconsider "danger" of not actively incorporating private sector involvement into working groups.</p> <p>It is unclear how a transparent methodology process with prevent scientific dissent on standard methodology.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	[AH:2/7/11] Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	[AH:2/7/11]	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Current PM funding is exactly 10% of GEF funds. Please lower to 8.5% or less as per new GEF practices unless PM budget can clearly identify need for additional funds up to 10%.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	[AH:2/7/11] No. is unclear why Component 2 will utilize so much of GEF funds (almost 60% of total GEF	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and outputs?	<p>resources) when building upon existing GEF projects. Please elaborate significantly these activities in text.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Thank you for the clarification.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Table A has a budget line named "Others" for \$100,000 without a Focal Area Objective. This is not acceptable and needs to be incorporated into the proper Objective or removed.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] All co-financing is pledged in-kind. Please strengthen agency co-financing in text (C.1) as well as actual amount of agency co-financing pledged with cash.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] P. 23 - Blue Carbon Initiative staff time (\$200,000) is listed as grant co-financing when should be in-kind.</p> <p>Also, UNEP-WCMC is listed as separate co-financing but is part of UNEP and needs to be included in Part C.1. Still reflected as parallel financing.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] UNEP is providing a total of \$1,575,000 (26% of total co-financing) that comes from its Blue</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Carbon Initiative, however it is noted that all co-financing is pledged in kind. Please reevaluate and provide additional detail in C.1 as it seems some of co-financing will be cash (e.g staff time and convening and attendance of expert workshops). Please explain why the "Blue Carbon" and "Management of Natural Coastal Carbon Sinks" Publications are included as co-financing since they have already been published.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Co-financing issues have been addressed and now approximately 40% of the \$8.270M comes in the form of grants.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed. Co-financing has increased to \$18,590,000</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	This is a very ambitious project and should have a lasting impact on	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>mainstreaming blue forests. Please kindly address the issues identified.</p> <p>[AH 2/23/11] To ensure creditability and accountability, it is essential that all assessments/reports/etc of C sequestration and other coastal and marine ecosystem services are taken into consideration - not just the high profile reports from large NGOs and IGOs. Accountability will be key in ensuring long-term success and needs to be addressed at PIF stage.</p> <p>Consider creating a new project component that will identify information and methodology gaps with C sequestration and other ecosystem services in environments other than mangroves, with outcomes that show progress in bringing these other environments up to the same level as what is known about C sequestration with mangroves.</p> <p>[AH:2/7/11]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please strengthen and include in budget line and project proposal text specific language that allocates "at least 1% of GEF funds" for IW:LEARN, project website, participation in IWCs and relevant conferences for project staff and government reps.</li> <li>- Please add mention of annual submission of IW tracking tool in</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project proposal text.</p> <p>- Please consider diversifying working groups to include private sector and other coastal/marine ecosystem experts, (e.g. coral experts).</p> <p>[AH 2/9/11]</p> <p>1) The PIF is very specific towards methodologies for C sequestration and does not do an adequate job integrating other blue forest ecosystem services (e.g. coastal protection, fish refugia, tourism, etc) that must be accounted for in valuation in the project design and framework. This also includes identifying the existing database and national strategies, plans, reports, assessments, and relevant conventions that the suite of other blue forest ecosystem services provide.</p> <p>2) Please elaborate how project's new methodology (Component 1) will be different from current methodologies outlined in baseline. It seems this aspect of budget could be reduced since "new" methodology will draw significantly from existing publications and reports. Twenty percent of the budget is being allocated to to this Component, but as the PIF demonstrates, a number of methodologies have already been developed. Is there room to minimize cost with synthesis of existing information?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>3) Project's expected outcomes are not quantitative enough, especially for components 1, 2, and 4. Please be more specific and identify tangible outputs for each expected outcome.</p> <p>4) Current PM funding is exactly 10% of GEF funds. Please lower to 8.5% as per new GEF practices unless PM budget can clearly identify need for additional funds (up to 10%).</p> <p>5) It is unclear why Component 2 will utilize so much of GEF funds (almost 60% of total GEF resources) when building upon existing GEF projects. Please elaborate significantly these activities in text.</p> <p>6) All co-financing is pledged in-kind. Please strengthen agency co-financing in text (C.1) as well as actual amount of agency co-financing with cash.</p> <p>7) It would be to the project's benefit if there was more private sector financial involvement to strengthen creditability as viable source of financing, both for C sequestration as well as other ecosystem services.</p> <p>[AH 3/1/11] As per new guidelines, please indicate amount of financial resources being allocated to each Expected Focal Area Outcome in Table A.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>[AH:3/22/11] Thank you for the revisions. The PIF is being recommended for the work program at this time but please note that a few issues still need to be address at CEO Endorsement stage, specifically please see cells 12, 14, and 17.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11] Issues above have been addressed, however recommendation is now not being given for the following reason from AI Duda: "The baseline project of UNEP is not clear. Section B1 has long paragraphs listing projects, but a simple list does not convey "a baseline program". The PIF should be revised to clarify how these separate projects constitute a baseline program and describe how GEF incremental cost transforms them into a coherent GEF project. Without this clarity, the PIF is not be recommended for work program inclusion."</p> <p>[AH 6/3/11] Recommendation is still not being granted because the UNEP baseline project is still not convincing. UNEP makes the argument for a fragmented baseline and then notes that this project will address that. You include some meetings as a baseline and say some other activities could contribute to the project, but this is too obtuseâ€</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Additionally, the role of WCMC and its baseline activities in this proposal are not clear. There needs to be a better explanation of how consistent monitoring and reporting of ecosystem datasets will be utilized by this proposal's activities. As the proposal reads now, the \$200,000 from WCMC is parallel co-financing.</p> <p>The correct way to present this is that UNEP has a Blue Forests Initiative it is developing with a number of separate components that will be tied together. UNEP has had consultations and studies with products generated from those as well as a number of complementary activities planned that consist of ___ and ___ and ___. This constitutes the UNEP baseline program on blue forests for which GEF is being asked to add incremental cost to achieve the larger objective _____. An enhanced objective and more significant outcomes will be accomplished by combining the baseline of UNEP, the financing of partners, and the GEF elements with agreed incremental costs.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] The PIF still needs to address key issues before it can be recommended: 1) The baseline is still unorganized and does not explain what the Blue Forest Initiative is already doing to address the problems highlighted in the PIF. This section needs to be completely rewritten in an</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>organized manner - not just amended from the previous PIFs. Please see AI's notes in the above [6/3/11] review; 2) The Project Framework and, to some extent the PIF text, still do not demonstrate how the methodologies will be incorporated into future GEF IW projects. This needs to be made much more clear throughout the PIF.</p> <p>Additional points that should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table A has a budget lined titled "others" requesting \$100,000 with no associated Focal Area Objective. Please remove or incorporate into the proper focal area objective.</li> <li>- Output 2.1 - It is not clear what the actual outputs will be from the small-scale interventions. The only verb in this output is applying the new methodologies. There should really be a more substantial result from this application like reports, evaluations, etc. This is likely the what the second output of this component is meant to do but it is not clear in the text.</li> <li>- Outcome 3 mentions "research and peer-reviewed literature" - to be more in line with the Focal Area strategy this should read targeted research.</li> <li>- The co-financing for component 5 is 1:1 (not changed since last PIF).</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- P. 23 - Blue Carbon Initiative staff time (\$200,000) is listed as grant co-financing when should be in-kind.</p> <p>- UNEP-WCMC is listed as separate co-financing but is part of UNEP and needs to be included in Part C.1. Still reflected as parallel financing.</p> <p>- LULUCF is incorrectly identified as LULUFC in several places throughout the text.</p> <p>- Consideration of recent blue forest developments by PIF partners and stakeholders should be reflected/updated in the PIF where necessary.</p> <p>[AH 8/29/11] All issues have been addressed - thank you. However, it has been requested that, "An important point was made on the need for 4:1 co-financing for GEF IW projects so that they could be seen as leveraging significant other funding and programs of partners. May we ask UNEP to reconsider the "blue forests" PIF and cobble together additional co-financing amounts."</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed. Co-financing has increased to \$18,590,000 and the ratio with GEF funds is now 1:4.1. The PIF is being recommended at this time.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 23, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 02, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2011	

\* **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?	<p>[AH 3/24/11] Proposed activities will establish a more useful baseline that will ensure the proposed activities of the PIF are most successful.</p> <p>However, PPG suggests that site selection will take place and be funded by PPG (Component 2). But PIF suggests that site selection will occur after methodologies are established (per Component 1). It might be advantageous to select sites in harmony with the outcomes of Project Component 1 to ensure success of the interventions.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>[AH 3/24/11] No, please justify \$40,000 in travel expenses - especially if site-selection for interventions is not necessary at PPG stage.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	[AH 3/24/11] Please see comments for quick fix prior before recommendation can be granted. Thank you.

		<p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 4/7/11]: Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 8/30/11] Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] With PIF recommendation, PPG is now also being recommended at this time.</p> <p>[AH 10/6/11] The PPG submitted with correct template. Thank you. Recommendation granted.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>[AH 3/24/11] Please consider adding the 2nd Marine Katoomba Meeting in La Paz. MX (Nov 2010) and the CI Blue Carbon Side Event in Cancun (Dec 2010) to the list of Table B: Past Project Prep Activities.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] The PPG submitted is the wrong template. Please use the most recent PPG template on the GEF website and resubmit. The GEF to co-financing ratio is 1.07:1</p> <p>[AH 10/6/11] The PPG submitted with correct template. Thank you. Recommendation granted.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 06, 2011

\* 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.