



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

GEF ID:	4533		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Development of Tools to Incorporate Impacts of Climatic Variability and Change in Particular Floods and Droughts into Basin Planning Processes		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$190,000	Project Grant:	\$4,090,000
Co-financing:	\$22,464,842	Total Project Cost:	\$26,744,842
PIF Approval:	January 06, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Kelly West

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?	N.A. This is a global project.	N.A. This is a global project.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	N.A. This is a global project.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. The agency has experience and proven record of results in scientific assessments and development of innovative approaches and tools. This project aims at development, testing and dissemination of broadly applicable methodology of incorporation of floods and droughts management into decision support systems for transboundary basins and their incorporation into IWRM approaches at different scales.	(12/6/2013): PI assessment remains valid. In the CEO cover memo/request for endorsement, please explain the references to UNEP programs #311 and # 111 (on page 5 of cover memo & pg. 17 of prodoc). (1/28/2014): This has been addressed and language explaining these "codes" been added.

*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)
		This fits with UNEP global mandate and recent work programmes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N.A.	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The UNEP's current Programme of Work includes support both to the development and application of IWRM and to building resilience to the adverse environmental impacts, including floods and droughts. Under the Sub-Program on Ecosystem Management, UNEP supports countries to identify and develop and test tools to strengthen ecosystems functioning for water regulation and purification services, particularly in developing countries. The tools developed include policy planning; assessment/identification of drivers, in particular climate variability. UNEP also supports countries in building climate resilience of vulnerable human societies, ecosystems and economies through increased understanding of multi-stressor interactions and the mobilization of knowledge, capacities and integrated assessment.	Yes, the project fits into UNEP's staff capacity - the emphasis right now is much on DSS (see our comments on that later) and the DHI is a leading organisation in this respect. IWA - from executing side - is equally well equipped to address the urban aspects.
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?	Yes.	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N.A.	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Yes. The project will contribute to the Outcome 1.4, as stated in the PIF. The agency is asked to indicate correct Objective and expected outcome in 1st line of Table A.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested correction was made. Cleared.</p>	Yes - aligned with FA strategy and results FW (outcome 1.4)
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>Yes. GEF IW 5 SO 1, it is however not clear whether also SO 3 is proposed, please clarify in Table A.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested correction was made. Cleared.</p>	Yes - no change from PIF stage.
	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?	N.A. This is a global project.	N.A. This is a global project.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes.	(12/6/2013). See also comments under 'project design' below: The project needs to be more clear 'who will be trained on what' in terms of the basin-wide "tools and methodologies" as it is not clear what other tools and methodologies besides the DSS are being developed. Please clarify in the resubmission. Currently it is therefore hard to say if the effort is sustainable in terms of the pilot basins. Please provide

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>more details in the project description and logframe.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): This has been addressed and more measurable targets added in this regard (who to be trained, on what and how many targeted groups or individuals).</p>
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>In principle yes but it is not entirely clear how the described recent and planned activities of key executing partners (DHI and IWA) in the field of DSS and droughts and flood management constitute the baseline projects, particularly from a global perspective. Please provide more justification.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested justification was provided in the revised document. Cleared.</p>	<p>In principle the baseline of issues relative to flood and drought management and DHI's and IWA's engagement in this regards are described. The concept of "baseline" is to be seen a bit wider as this is a global project.</p> <p>Two comments (see also same comment under qu. 14 below):</p> <p>(1) It is not clear why a project "requested by GEFSEC" would "not aim to support national policies and plans". The formulation and origin of this is unclear both in the endorsement memo and in prodoc (section 3.6/pg. 38). Please explain and/or reformulate as this formulation also risks the impression that the project is not aimed at country needs - which is clearly not the case.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The comment has been addressed and language changed.</p> <p>(2) Drought management (2.1) - it would be good to enhance the section in the prodoc e.g. there is no mention of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>groundwater (prodoc 2.1). In times of drought groundwater often serves as important buffer. Drought management options may want to include managed recharge and other. In any case, drought management needs to address conjunctive management of surface and groundwater which is not mentioned in the project document.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The comment has been addressed in several locations on the prodoc.</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>(12/6/2013): please see comment under question 10 and address in resubmission.</p> <p>Yet, it also has to be kept in mind that this question cannot be fully addressed as costs effectiveness will depend on the specific context.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): no further comment. This is hard to fully address in a global project aiming at developing and piloting tools. Cost effectiveness of the effort will/ can be addressed during implementation to assess the cost effectiveness of these tools.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>No, the Incremental Reasoning needs to be rewritten and the arguments strengthen.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested information/argumentation was provided in the revised document. Cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, the overall explanation on incrementality is provided. Again, being a global project this description necessarily will differ from other IW projects.</p> <p>One comment (see also qu. 14 below): The background section is surprising lacking the concept of benefit sharing in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the context of flood and drought management in a transboundary context. It may be worth to mention that cooperation in context of extreme events is often an effective entry point for transboundary dialogue and cooperation.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The comment has been addressed with providing some reference to the concept of benefit sharing with respect to flood and drought management.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>The project design is sound but several items require more clarification or specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project should be more specific on the importance of the methodology and tools for GEF IW transboundary basin projects; - The expected outcomes need to be more specific, in particular to make clear what are the differences between various outputs on stakeholders training (e.g. output 2.3 v. 3.2); - Stakeholder consultation workshops for selected basin will serve only to the component 1 outcome or they will be used for pilot basins testing use of DSS and TDA/SAPs review? - In component 3 review and amendment of up to five TDAs and SAPs is expected. It is not clear whether the project will look through these and see how they compare to what tools the project has developed, please clarify; - The language of the outcome 3.3 is not 	<p>(12/6/2013):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The logframe lacks quantifiable targets - i.e. it is not clear who and how many people are to be trained on "tools and methodologies". Further, there is no indication on how many urban centers are targeted in each pilot basin. The lack of quantified targets also will not allow to provide a clear picture of project success in future. - The project mentions the development of 'tools and methodologies', but the activities are focussed on the DSS. In fact wording gives the impression that the terms "tools and methodologies" are interchangeably used with "DSS". Please enhance the description to 'paint the picture' on the type/range of expected tools besides the DSS (e.g. there is no mention of zoning, floodplain mapping, response planning, mechanisms for planning/assessing upstream watershed measures, or other).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>clear, please revise;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The outcome of component 4 is not clear in terms of mutual inter-relation between the urban and (agro) industrial water users in optimalisation of basin water mangement, it sounds like a one way street input from those water users; - The out put 4.4 is meant to communicate results only to stakeholders of this component or to all project stakeholders, please clarify. <p>Dec 02, 2011: All above concerns, questions and requested clarification were adressed in the revised document. Cleared.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The background section is surprising lacking the concept of benefit sharing in the context of flood and drought management in a transboundary context. It may be worth to mention that cooperation in context of extreme events is often an effective entry point for transboundary dialogue. - (see also previous comment): Drought management (2.1) - it would be good to enhance the section in the prodoc e.g. there is no mention of groundwater (prodoc 2.1). In times of drought groundwater often serves as important buffer - drought management options may want to include managed recharge and other. In any case, drought management needs to address conjunctive management of surface and groundwater which is not mentioned in the project document. - While one of the aims of the project is to include considerations of floods and droughts in the TDA-SAP process, it is not clear how the pilot and learning basins will pilot this as none of them is known to aim at updating their TDA or SAP at present. Updating the TDA/SAPs is not mentioned in the prodoc either. Please explain further. - The reduction from the anticipated up to five to three pilot basins is reasonable and agreed (cahnge from PIF stage). Additional clarification how the three

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>pilot basins were selected out of the 23 "finalists" in the table on page 29 would be beneficial to the transparency of this selection.</p> <p>- While cooperation with IW:Learn is described, please more explicitly set aside/indicate that 1 % of the project grant is designated for IW:Learn activities.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): no further comment. The comments above have been responded to in the revised prodoc and the response matrix. Quantifiable indicators have been added in the LF, explanation has been provided on the scope of tools and their use for scenario building, and the selection of the basins. In addition , text to expand on groundwater in drought context and sepecific grant amount for IW: Learn.</p> <p>In context of IW:Learn we ask for a few simple corrections (which can be done while in the interim the package is culated to Council for four weeks) - see comment in qu. 33: Please make the following small change during the circulation time and prior to final endorsement:</p> <p>(i) substituting in project framework, workplan, etc; IWC 8/9 for IWC 7/8 (we are done with IWC 7...); (ii) add in outcome 4.2 to the outputs clearly 'participation at IWC 8/9' not</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>only "materials for dissemination". In fact there needs to be a well designed interactive session/w-shop/knowledge cafe or other to allow other projects to be aware and take advantage of the tools and methodologies developed in this global project (e.g. an easy spot would be in project framework pg 5; footnote on page 61 and/or in workplan). It is important to make a real effort on mainstreaming the efforts within this project and disseminating this within the portfolio (even early on); else we will risk not getting any traction until years down the road. So while this may seem "minor changes" we feel they make a difference to the portfolio-wide impact of this project.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>No. The GEB are neither described nor justified.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested GEB justification was included in the revised document. Cleared.</p>	<p>See earlier comment of lack of acknowledging benefit sharing and role that e.g. flood and drought management can play in basin-wide dialogue and cooperation. This would enhance the description on IW related GEBs as well. Other than that GEBs are explained as 'global significance' inter alia in section 2.2.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been 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>Yes.</p>	<p>- There is no clear recognition in the project description on how social and gender factors and wider stakeholder participation is achieved in the project activities. For example, in urban context there is no mention of the fact that all too often the most flood prone areas are</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>those that are occupied by informal settlements of the poor. Rezoning for example would also often affect them directly.</p> <p>- Gender and women inclusion is mentioned in the prodoc in several places, but it is unclear WHAT the project is actually doing to address gender concerns.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed and clearer provisions been added in the prodoc both on gender and social dimensions/poverty and settlement in flood prone areas.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>No. Although this is a global project the application of the project outputs at number of pilot basin require consider the role of civil society, indigenous people and gender issues.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The document was revised accordingly. Cleared.</p>	<p>- See above comments under qu. 16.</p> <p>- Participation/participatory approaches are mentioned in the prodoc, but not specified what is done and who are targeted in the activities. For urban based activities, for example, the impression is that this will mostly reach urban planners and utilities and private sector players, yet impacts of e.g. flood preparedness and damage reduction measures is affecting a range of societal groups and stakeholders beyond the ones explicitly mentioned. Please strengthen this in the project description/project framework.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed. See above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>Yes.</p>	<p>Climate change: Yes, the project is connescent of and partly motivated by the increase in extreme events due to increasing climate variability and change - such as increasing frequency and severity of floods and droughts.</p> <p>Comment: Please explain better how is the project taking advantage of existing down-scaling efforts? As collabroation with the WB is mentioned on modeling efforts, please note that the WB Climate Portal and the WB Water Anchor team have developed climate risk assessments for most watersheds (based on a range of available models). Also, while the project the WB GAMS models (where is used these days besides in Asia?), there is no obvious institutional link described with the WB. It would be useful to describe this cooperation more clearly which is only somewhat mentioned in the text.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed and partnerships e.g. with WB described in more detail.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>N.A. This is a global project.</p>	<p>In terms of the pilot basins: - Lake Victoria and Nile Basin Initiative (NBI): it is not clear that while DHI is engaged in the Nile DSS there is not any letter from the NBI or clear indication on how the project is working with Nile Sec or NELSAP. Why is interaction agreed with the Lake Vic Commission only and not also NileSec while the Nile DSS is being developed by NBI staff</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>(and mainstreamed/used in basin country use)?</p> <p>- Minor comment/request: Please clarify how is the LVBC planned Water Information Systems related to the Nile DSS?</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed and explanation been provided in the text on link of LVBS model and Nile DSS.</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>Overall yes. Please explain though the change in the scope of the outcome on pilot testing of the DSS. The PIF stage outcome 2 "on enhanced tools and guidance at transboundary and national levels to predict and respond to floods and droughts hazards" seemed more action oriented and leading to more concrete outcomes than the current outcome 2 aiming at " enabling the prediction of f&d consideration into IWRM, TDA-SAP, water safety and other planning processes". Please explain this apparent shift in outcome from an operational/real-time model & tools to a planning model/tools in the CEO cover memo.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed and explanation provided in Part II.</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. it is within GEF acceptable range and proportional to the overall co-financing ratio.	Yes. it is within GEF acceptable range.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Not possible to asses at this stage since the agency is being asked to strengthen the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested information/clarifiacion on GEB was added in the revised document. Cleared. However, the overall co-financing is not adequate, the agency is being asked to increase the co-financing at minimum 1:5.</p> <p>Jan 04, 2012: The co-financing was increased to 1:5. Cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, the overall figures of co-financing are adequate, yet some specifics may need either clarification or revision -see question 25 below.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The co-financing is appropriate to this type of project.	<p>- Co-finance from Hydro and Agro-Informatics Institute: the co-finance seems to be based on an initiative that is closing or has closed in 2013. Please clarify; if "co-finance" is based on a past/nearly past intervention, it is not co-finance but can be accounted for in the baseline.</p> <p>- LVEMP: There appear to be some double-counting of co-finance. e.g. LVEMP 2 is co-financed by GEF and ts co-finance cannot count again here.</p> <p>- Please clarify the NBI DSS co-finance</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>- is this based on current or previous DSS contract (under the SVP Water Resources Management project).</p> <p>- The ICPDR co-finance of 500 Euro is excellent and reflects the intend & commitment of the Danube as a learning basin. Please solidify this cooperation with another confirmation; the letter from ICPDR indicates that ICPDR would be ready to provide a more specific commitment for cooperation in the fall of 2013. The prodoc states that discussions with ICPDR was intended at IWC in Barbados, yet it does not appear that this materialized. A confirmation of co-finance & cooperation from the new Executive Secretary of the ICPDR (letter or email) would be helpful.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): comments have been addressed - co-finance figures have been slightly adjusted and re-confirmation obtained both from ICPDR and LVEMP.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		N/A for global project. Comments on the RF have been provided under qu. 14.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		(Question to be addressed after revised RF has been submitted. Targets are weak/vague at this point.)
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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>(12/6/2013): Yes - STAP requested major revisions at WP entry.</p> <p>As no STAP review/interaction was submitted with the request for endorsement, GEF SEC followed up which led to additional time needed in being able to send a review sheet back to the agency.</p> <p>STAP reviewed the submitted prodoc and had no further comments; it found that previous comments were addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		Germany requested the circulation of the final project document four weeks prior to CEO endorsement.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	None.	None.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. The agency is asked to address the comments above.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The agency addressed all but one concerns and comments satisfactorily. The PM would recommend the CEO clearance into the next WP when agency will increase the co-financing to minimum 1:5.</p> <p>Jan 04, 2012: The agency addressed all concerns and comments satisfactorily. Now the PM recommends the CEO clearance into the next WP.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>(12/6/2013) - not yet. Kindly address comments in the review sheet above.</p> <p>Please also keep in mind that Germany requested circulation of the final project document four weeks prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Please make the following small change during the circulation time and prior to final endorsement:</p> <p>(i) substituting in project framework, workplan, etc; IWC 8/9 for IWC 7/8 (we are done with IWC 7...);</p> <p>(ii) add in outcome 4.2 to the outputs clearly 'participation at IWC 8/9" not only "materials for dissemination". In fact there needs to be a well designed interactive session/w-shop/knowledge cafe or other to allow other projects to be aware and take advantage of the tools and methodologies developed in this global project (e.g. an easy spot would be in project framework pg 5; footnote on page 61 and/or in workplan). It is important to make a real effort on mainstreaming the efforts within this project and disseminating this within</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the portfolio (even early on); else we will risk not getting any traction until years down the road. So while this may seem "minor changes" we feel they make a difference to the portfolio-wide impact of this project.</p> <p>(1/28/2014): The technical comments by GEFSEC have been addressed. The updated package is being recommended for circulation to Council prior to endorsement (as per Council request).</p> <p>PM recommended for CEO endorsement - no Council comments were received.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 17, 2011	December 06, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		January 28, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>It is not clear what type of input is requested to be paid for in the activity 1 on PPG coordination and consultation. Please be more specific. Also the first item in activity 2 seems to be the same as (or a part of) very similar output in Component 1 in the PIF. Please clarify.</p> <p>Dec 05, 2011 (IZ):</p>

		The revised PPG responded accordingly to concerns raised. all proposed activities and PPG outputs are appropriate for this project. Cleared.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Not possible to assess yet according to questions raised above. Dec 05, 2011 (IZ): Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet, the agency is asked to provide clarifications or revise the PPG request according to the comments above. Dec 05, 2011 (IZ): The PM now recommends the PPG approval once the CEO clears the PPG for next WP inclusion.
	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.