



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4748 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad) | | |
| Project Title: | Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4797 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | International Waters |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | IW-1; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$300,000 | Project Grant: | \$5,830,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$236,282,304 | Total Project Cost: | \$242,412,304 |
| PIF Approval: | April 23, 2013 | Council Approval/Expected: | June 20, 2013 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | Expected Project Start Date: | | |
| Program Manager: | Astrid Hillers | Agency Contact Person: | Ms. Mame Dagou DIOP |

| 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? | 13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the countries are eligible. | (April 13, 2015). Yes, countries are eligible. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Attached to the Central African Republic, Niger and Chad endorsement letters have been included in the PIF submission. Please forward the remaining endorsement letters. 5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Endorsement letter have been forwarded for Cameroon. The PIF mentions that endorsement letter from Nigeria can be expected to be arriving prior to | |

*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) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>webposting.</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): Yes, endorsement letters for all five countries have been submitted (Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Niger, Nigeria).</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Please provide a copy of the endorsed prodoc to OFPs for their information (as endorsements are from 2011 and four out of five OFPs have changed since).</p> | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | <p>13th of December 2011 (cseverin): The GEF agency were part of developing the SAP for Lake Chad together with the World Bank in the project titled: "Reversal of land and Water Degradation Trends in the lake Chad Basin Ecosystem. " hence the agency have substantial comparative advantage.</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): UNDP has experience in the region through the previous project - as mentioned. In addition, the proposed small grants component is based on years of SGP experience. UNDP will also coordinate and collaborate with efforts of World Bank and its aims for enhanced engagement in Lake Chad region.</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). UNDP has experience in the region and is building on the previous effort with LCBC.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): UNDP, GIZ, and AfDB have been coordinating in the preparation phase and there is clear aim to cooperate in the implementation of the respective projects to assure complementarity and making use of comparative advantages of the institutions.</p> <p>Please explain briefly why the SGP implementation has been discarded and IUCN has been chosen to for delivery under component 5(under alternatives considered).</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Explanation has been provided. IUCN 's field presence is an advantage to project implementation. Cleared.</p> |

| 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? | N.A. | N/A |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | 13th of December 2011 (cseverin): The agency have field presence in the five Lake Chad countries. | (April 13, 2015). UNDP is leading this from side of regional advisor and country offices. Its country presence will aid the project implementation. |
| 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? | 13th of December 2011 (cseverin) & (9 April 2013; AHillers): The requested funds are available under the IW focal area allocation. | (April 13, 2015). GEF 5 resources were set aside for this project at PIF work program entry. |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | <p>13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the project is aligned with the IW focal area results framework with its expected outcomes and output indicators.</p> <p>However, please do rework the included output indicators that are not quantifiable in their nature. The presently, included output indicators are appropriately linked to the components and expected outcomes, but should be reformulated into indicators towards which it will be easier to measure progress.</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). Yes, the project is overall aligned with the GEF 5 IW RF. Yet, please explain deviation from the outcomes and expected outcomes in the PIF to what is presented at endorsement stage. The delivery of the project appears substantially less then expected at PIF stage. The number of components and hence outcomes was reduced which appears a considerable change from the PIF. We suggest that in addition to a response matrix we also discuss directly.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): The endorsement</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): At time of CEO Endorsement, PLEASE DO rework/reformulate the output indicators so that they will be easier to measure, i.e. they need to be quaitifiable in nature.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. The comments in this review sheet refer to the revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2012; AHillers): The need to refine outputs and indicators still holds in part. Links and synergies between project components should also be made more clear. For example, output 2.2. and 3.2 seem very similar. For further details see comments under question # 14.</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): The revised PIF is overall consistent with the GEF IW strategy Objective 1. Yet , the reference to what exactly is implemented of the SAP and its indicators needs to be more specific components/the content of the Chad Basin SAP. See also comments below under question # 14. For example, component 2 capacity strengthening just</p> | <p>document has been revised and explanations for deviations provided. Yet, there remains concern to demonstrate stress reduction impact at SAP implementation state - especially in view of dire need in the regions for impact and investments to increase resilience. See detailed comments below (and respond there; # 14).</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Comments addressed via better explanation of impacts of the project and coordination with AfDB. See comments under 14 to address during implementation of the project. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | refers to any capacities needed for all/any actions in the SAP - please be more specific to be able to assess the extend/scope of capacity enhancement in ministries and academic institutions; the type or scope of institutional and policy reforms aimed at. (12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed. | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | 13th of December 2011 (cseverin): yes, the relevant GEF 5 IW-1 objective has been included. | (April 13, 2015). Yes. IW 1 - SAP implementation has been identified - and IW 3 in terms of institutional strengthening. PLEASE NOTE : under component 1.1. there is reference to the 5 year Lake Chad investment plan. Some of the listed activities in the plan are neither eligible for GEF finance nor should GEF finance be eligible to be used for feasibility studies ; including inter-basin transfers. (10/17/2016): Comment addressed. |
| | 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? | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project is in line with the countries national strategies and plans, as it will be implementing the Strategic Action Programme that was signed between the countries in 2008. _____ _____ (9 April 2013: AHillers) - The PIF has been revised to account for new | (April 13, 2015). See comment of 9 April 2013 which remains to large degree valid. While the project is consistent with the endorsed SAP the description of alignment with national strategies and plans needs to be strengthened. (10/17/2016): Comment remains valid. Please address and provide reference (incl. date) especially on alignment with national water resources strategies and |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): The project is consistent with the SAP which was endorsed by all countries. The current PIF does not elaborate linkages with other relevant national strategies, such as PRSPs or their equivalent which may have been updated since 2008 (i.e. since endorsement of the SAP). As the project will aim to enhance the LCBC's and the riparian countries' capacities to address climate variability and change, it also would be useful to briefly reflect on NAPAs and other country based strategies in the final project document.</p> <p>Please address in project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> | <p>reference to national biodiversity strategies (as relevant to component 1.2)</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Additional information has been included in Section 2.2..</p> <p>While the relevant documents are referenced in that section there is little specific analysis on the synergy and alignment of the project and chosen SAP priorities with NBSAPs, NAPAs on national level. On regional level the project should analyze the specific alignment with the Lake Chad Climate Resilience Plan which was presented in Paris Climate COP in 2015.</p> <p>Please provide such detail in the project inception report (or PIR) and share with GEFSEC.</p> <p>Comment cleared.</p> |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | <p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): The project will among others work through the Lake Chad Commission as the central coordination body for the project and its activities, hence the capacities built, will be part of the sustainability for the entire project implementation as well as the long term sustainability strategy for project outcomes. Further, activities will be coordinated with national governments, as well as local governments and community organisations.</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). Yes. For example the harmonization of policies and regulations on national level with the regional water charter will contribute to its national implementation and hence effectiveness.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Component 3 budget for capacity building and training has doubled, yet the description in the text remains very general and with little specificity and clear indication of an end of project target (especially for 3.1) and contribution to project deliverables. Please address.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): The revised PIF aims at strengthen capacities on national level in terms of institutional structures, policy reforms, and monitoring capacity to implement and update the SAP and align NAPs with the SAP. It also aims to strengthen the capacities of LCBC especially with regards to assessing impacts of climate variability and change in the SAP update and investment plans. Building of national capacities to achieve regional outcomes is sound, yet the project description and the project framework should be more specific on what policy and institutional type/scope of reforms are envisioned to implement what priorities of the SAP (e.g. is the focus on water/food security hence SAP priorities related to restoring or maintaining surface and groundwater quantity/quality and related secosystems & effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater?; - just as example, it is unlikely for one project to effectively cover all topics/issues in the SAP; please spell out which are main areas that are intended to be addressed). Please be more specific in this regard in</p> | <p>(4/22/2017). Comment cleared.</p> <p>During project implementation a training needs assessment will be carried out and a training plan formulated. The indicative target figures seem low and need to be revisited in this effort. This will be reviewed at MTR. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>components 2 and 3. In addition, the title of component 3 would greatly benefit from rewording to indicate the goal of this component in substance more clearly - the SAP is a tool to achieve certain objectives; hence "achieving and sustaining the SAP" is not a goal in itself.</p> <p>Please address in revised PIF.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments 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>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline projects seems to be built on healthy assumptions. However, please do make sure that there is no double counting between the 17 mio included as the national contributions from the Water and Environment ministries and what has already been counted against the AfDB Lake Chad programme.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers): The baseline is described in the revised PIF. Some of the baseline projects seems to be rather part of alternative (i.e. are co-finance to</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). The baseline description in section I.7 needs strengthening; while it should be noted that the project is based on the TDA/SAP process - which includes data and information to substantiate project interventions, the project document itself should nevertheless include a more comprehensive baseline and strengthened rationale with respect to the specific project interventions.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): The project description has been strengthened and especially on the regional level there is an updated and clarified cooperation agreement between key development partners on baselines and increment on regional level.</p> <p>Yet, there is very little of information on country baseline as it relates to the specific project activities. Please provide key information - e.g. in form of</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | <p>alternative) - such as UNESCO work, AWF, EU, GIZ, BGR, EU, and IUCN co-finance. This is consistent with the list of co-financing partners. During project design (by CEO endorsement), please provide mechanisms/explanation on how all these related initiatives are coordinated on an ongoing basis to create/harness synergies and avoid overlaps.</p> <p>- Please elaborate/explain for UNESCO as well as project activities the need for signing general commitment to conjunctive management of surface and groundwater or adoption of the UNGA resolution on TB groundwater. As it stands, this seems to be well addressed in the Water Charter of May 2012.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed. This was dropped as this is already addressed in the Water Charter.</p> <p>- Please also explain linkages with the ongoing GEF finance for Lake Chad (AfDB as implementing agency) - it is mentioned in some table , but a short para would be needed to address this in more detail as these are related GEF finance aiming at SAP implementation.</p> <p>Please address in revised PIF.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p> | <p>a short table focused on the specifics related to main project component deliverables (especially given the age of TDA/SAP baseline). This information could be provided upfront or within the component descriptions (again, brief/concise is sufficient at this stage but needed to underpin component activity design).</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Cleared at present state. Component 1 and especially 1.4 and 1.5 to strengthen LCBC capacity for coordination should address a better overview and monitoring on this. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>- LCBC has plans on interbasin transfer from Congo basin (listed under projects on LCBC website). A feasibility study has been recently concluded. Please provide assurance that GEF alternative is not linked to an effort that is unclear at this point of its environmental and social impacts.</p> <p>Please address in revised PIF (e.g. under risk matrix) .</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</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>(April 13, 2015). There is little analysis to that effect obvious in the submission (section II.6) . We would appreciate if UNDP could provide more information/explanation.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Will likely be addressed when responding to comments under 11 and 14.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Comment cleared. During implementation the cost effectiveness of the IUCN implemented activities under component 5 once designed and location finalized need to be analyzed case by case before implementation and should be demonstrated to the PSC. Cleared.</p> |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning? | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the GEF funded activities are based on a incremental reasoning. | (April 13, 2015). The majority of the activities are clearly articulated as forming part of regional actions or national actions within the regional umbrella defined by the SAP. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers): please update text of incremental cost reasoning to reflect that the LCBC has finalized the Water Charter in May 2012 (text pg. 11 states that it "would be finalized"); while not ratified by countries yet. The component description has been updated already.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p> | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | <p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the project framework is based on a sound set of IW outcome indicators, however, please do make sure to rework the output indicators so that they become more quantifiable and easier to measure progress towards. Further the output indicators would also benefit from an overhaul to make them come closer to the output indicators in the IW GEF 5 strategy.</p> <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Please do make sure, at time of CEO endorsement, that the included OUTPUT indicators are aligned with the IW GEF 5 strategy as well as made more quantifiable, in order to be able to easier to measure progress.</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). The project description and content appears to deliver much less than what was envisioned at PIF stage yet for the same amount of resources.</p> <p>- We understand that some PIF envisioned deliverables are now taken up by development partners - such as GIZ (TDA/SAP update) and BGR (groundwater balance and information systems). These partners are listed as co-finance to the project. Please assure that these complementary activities which were initially part of the anticipated PIF outputs are mentioned in the letters of co-finance.</p> <p>- The PIF expected that the project</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | <p>Further, please also make sure to include specific wording that speaks to the effect of the fact that the project will allocate a budgetline of 1% of the GEF grant to support IWLEARN activities, such as setting up a webpage according to the IWLEARN guidelines, writing up at least two IW experience notes, participating in regional IW meetings as well as the IWCs during the project lifetime.</p> <p>Moreover, the document at CEO endorsement should also include a sentence on the fact that the project will be reporting using the Consolidated IW tracking tool.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need to not only update, but overall revise the present SAP. We appreciate/comment the projects aim to strengthen SAP with regard to addressing climate variability and change and enhancing attention to conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Additionally the updated | <p>would support drafting and approval of the environmental annexes to the Lake Chad Water Charter and development of the LCBC Biodiversity Protocol. Please explain if this remains part of the project and if not why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PIF also mentions management of the Lake Chad basin and a comprehensive lake monitoring system and regional information sharing system to be developed through the LCBC Environmental Observatory. Please confirm that these remain outputs of the project. - The prodoc component 1.2 addresses disaster risk reduction response plans which includes among other the 'definition of drought and flood forecasting', which would to our mind include specs for a forecasting system ,but lagging far behind 4.2 expected deliverables in the PIF ("climate data system installed and made operational to support drought and flood management practices, development of Early Warning Systems and the prediction of future climate and its impacts in Lake Chad on both ground and surface water resources"). Notably a flood and drought early warnings system is not included as target in the project RF - please comment. - Please more clearly elaborate how the project will enhance more effective |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>SAP needs to be intergrated/aligned with broader development and investment plans - this is somewhat indicated in output 1.3, but the link to all productive sectors is not spelled out (e.g. to address entire span of food/energy/water/ecosystems nexus). Kindly also provide a clear reference for the 'LCBC investment plans' (which? - e.g. food security and livelihoods etc. would figure in there - correct?).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in the project document.</p> <p>- The reason for seperating components 1 and 6 in that regard is not clear and not articulated in the PIF. The combination of components 1 and 6 (you may even consider to merge 1 and 6 during project design) should include an assessment of socio-economically and environmentally viable opportunities on one hand and constraints on other hand to development in the basin and underlying reasons for these (including water availabailability/decrease in lake levels; options to increase climate resilience/claimte resilient development; ...). Such assessment(s) and updating TDA and SAP would necessarily be linked. Please consider during project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- Component 1.4 : it appears the</p> | <p>conjunctive management of surface and groundwater and through which project deliverables.</p> <p>(10/17/2016):</p> <p>The project description has been significantly updated since the last submission and adjusted to realities of support by other development partners which are meanwhile being implemented.</p> <p>Please address comments below which are based on this rewritten/redesigned project document and hence do not and cannot necessarily build on previous comments:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>- wording that projects are implemented successfully is noted but should not be limited to 'donor expectations' but include the country based stakeholders/ministries</p> <p>- Flood and drought monitoring and response (components 1 and 4): Please clarify what forecasting system will be put in place? Flood and drought forecasting, monitoring and response differ substantially and there is little acknowledgement and detail provide across components 1 and 4 to acknowledge this or indicate partners and stakeholders that the project will partner with. Please add detail both in text and logframe/expected end of</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>riparians envision drafting the environmental (and other outstanding annexes) after ratification of the Water Charter. This will require time; how is this expected to align with the project timeframes? Also, the text (pg. 11)states that the project will support the adoption of a "LCBC Biodiversity Protocol " - please clarify and make sure project FW reflects this consistently.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p> <p>Component 2 and 3:</p> <p>- Please be more specific of what parts of SAP/which SAP priorities are being implemented (incl SAP targets/indicators) and hence would need to be supported by the enabling conditions described such as enhanced national capacities, policies and legal reforms that are envisioned with project support. Based on this, please tighten the indicative output/deliverables of components 2 and 3.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.</p> <p>- also see comment #10- the title of component 3 would greatly benefit from rewording to indicate the goal of this component - the SAP is a tool to achieve certain objectives; hence "achieving and sustaining the SAP" is</p> | <p>project deliverable.</p> <p>- How will this and component 4 efforts incorporate, build on and not duplicate GEF IW/AfDB activities on regular monitoring of basin surface - and groundwater resources and alert/early warning system, and ICT based modeling of water flow and lake levels (see Annex 3 - mapping matrix)? What more exactly is the division of labor in this regard?</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>- Please provide some detail on deliverables under component 2.1. What are the major deficits that the harmonization of national policies with Lake Chad water charter needs to address (provides some examples; does not need to be all comprehensive but please indicate the main gaps that motivate the project component activities and ill be addressed during implementation).</p> <p>- Please detail in text what is envisioned to strengthen conjunctive management (page 29 prodoc does not mention this).</p> <p>- comp 2.2. : please align timeline for 'functional SMCs' so these are functioning to support the SAP update in timely manner (i.e. before SAP update adoption by ministers in the basin) (please adjust in logframe to assure that SAP update approval is based in inter-ministerial discussions).</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>not a goal in itself. Same is true for the expected outcome of component 3.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p> <p>- Outputs 2.2. and 3.2 appear very similar given project description.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed. This has been revised/clarified.</p> <p>- Please clarify what funding mechanisms besides GEF are in place for SAP finance (pg 14).</p> <p>- Please specify in more detail what IWRM and water efficiency strategies are aimed (pg 15 , top) - "optimum and efficient water use for ALL (?) purposes" is a very good objective overall, but does not give a realistic picture of what this project will be able to address and deliver.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.</p> <p>Component 4: Please elaborate more clearly the role of UNESCO as executing agency in the component description(s).</p> <p>The outputs of component 4 seem ambitious and not entirely realistic to be all achievable with current level of finance/co-finance (flood and drought</p> | <p>Component 3:</p> <p>- See previous comment (under question on capacity building) and provide some clarity on scope and impact of training with respect to the project deliverables. The budget of component 3 has doubled, yet especially component 3.1. only provides a very general description and the logframe does not indicate number of people targeted. Please address.</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>- 4.1 mentions the adoption of data exchange protocols in consistency with the Water Charter. Please reflect this in the logframe.</p> <p>- 4.2: Please address together with the comment on flood/drought forecasting and DRM in component 1.</p> <p>Component 5:</p> <p>SAP implementation and resilience will require measurable investments and deliverables on community level (among other). In that context the component is well placed. Only financing "pilots" is unlikely to meet SAP implementation requirements and please aim for impact - the wording of pilots indicates otherwise. In many of these topics one should be beyond a</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | <p>early warning systems; lake monitoring system (see below); regional groundwater model; regional information sharing system).</p> <p>- The aim to support regional early warning systems for droughts and floods is appreciated. Both actions will differ in data and information needs on regional and national level. Within this effort, please note that national hydromet stations are considered to be actions of countries. They should be financed out of national budgets not regional GEF funds; this is to ensure that these installations (incl. O&M) are part of national sector activities and budgets to assure sustainability.</p> <p>- The lake monitoring system appears ambitious in addressing surface and groundwater quality, quantity and ecosystems status. In addition the text states that a wetlands monitoring and management system be put in place (pg 11). Further, it is not clear what the Lake Chad "Indicator Program" is to encompass.</p> <p>Overall, component 4 seems to be tackling too many items that are each complex - unless the baseline description is missing to outline in enough detail already ongoing/existing efforts e.g. through BGR, GIZ, EU, and others. Please comment/address in revised PIF (incl. considering greater</p> | <p>need for 'proof of concept' and looking at scale-up.</p> <p>Given the security situation in the region and difficulties to access certain areas, it is appreciated that not all measures and investments can be determined at present and additional detail will need to be developed during project design. This should be noted as an exception ! It is unusual to encounter a project document with little to no indication of the delivery mechanism, detail of interventions and scope/targets.</p> <p>While there is mention of e.g. "10" community projects such as under component 5.1 this does not provide any idea of scale/budget or impact. even given the specific situation and difficulties in work on the ground in parts of the basin we would expect to see some more clarity under 5.1. and 5.2. including (but not solely limited to) clear criteria for selection of pilots. Will 5.2 only develop finance mechanisms and/or what will it fund. The language as written is not clear.</p> <p>- Please reflect some provision of scope, scale, envisioned impact of interventions in table B.</p> <p>- Please also provide an estimated/indicative percentage of the budget under component 5 for for investment versus exchange of</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>relative allocation to this component by decreasing funds to another component).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments regarding component 4 have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Component 5: During project design/by CEO endorsement, please consider to not limit "promotion of women involvement ..." to Chad and overall reevaluate and allow for stakeholder drivenness on what small grants are delivered where. Please also elaborate in project design how to supervise these decentralized efforts based on security situation in large parts of basins.</p> <p>- In revised PIF - please indicate the approximate scale/scope of the two or more pilot projects. How was it decided (or will it be decided) what number and type of pilots will be? (12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.</p> <p>Component 6 - see comments under component 1. Please align both components in project design or merge these efforts. Collaboration with the World Bank mainly on component 6 - and in substance likely also much of component 1 (and possibly 4)- is going to benefit countries through providing base and leveraging substantial investments to improve natural resource</p> | <p>experiences.</p> <p>Component 6:</p> <p>- Please align the logframe closer to the text on pages 40/41 of prodoc to assure consistency (e.g. the LF indicates 'two investments per country' . This wording does not seem to align with the intent of the component, please clarify.)</p> <p>Please indicate sex disaggregated data collection across all relevant component indicators in the logframe.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Most comments have been addressed. We recommend to address the remaining issues on coordination during project implementation and report via inception report, PIR and MTR (at latest).</p> <p>- During project implementation the UNDP and AfDB implemented/supported regional projects to support the Lake Chad (the present project and PMIS 9446) will need to further coordinate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - specific roles in supporting donor coordination mechanisms (component one of present project); - specific roles to support the effective implementation of data sharing in |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>management and livelihoods.</p> <p>Please address above comments in revised PIF (unless indicated specifically to be addressed during project design stage/before CEO endorsement).</p> <p>Other (to be addressed during project design):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability: Please address how the LCBC is presently financed. In project design/by CEO endorsement built in a proposed system to be agreed by countries to assure financial sustainability of the institution. <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other project design/sustainability: In project design/by CEO endorsement - please elaborate on project execution details - such as need for intermediary to handle funds for LCBC (UNOPS was used in first project) and if so how LCBC FM and procurement capacity will be strengthened during the project. <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> | <p>accordance with the Water Charter and standardization of data; as well as coordination on type of data collected on national levels (component 4 this project)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - efforts on drought warning and DRR on drought (addressed to some degree by both projects) whereas the current project is also addressing DRM plans for flood events. <p>-please note that GEF finance will not support investments or pre-feasibility /feasibility work on investments that may lead to significant adverse environmental and/or social impacts (including any inter-basin transfers).</p> <p>Cleared.</p> |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the methodology have been properly tested with successful outcomes in other basins, which would then also be | (April 13, 2015). The prodoc deliverables are in line with the SAP and main aim appears on mainstreaming the Lake Chad Water charter in the |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>expected in this case.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF: overall Yes, but the impacts on addressing water availability challenges and specificity on what specifically of the SAP is implemented needs to be clarified (which SAP priorities/targets).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> | <p>policies, strategies, and finance in the basin countries as well as finance of awareness and community based actions. While this is appreciated there appears a notable deviation in project scope and deliverables from the PIF that warrants a better presentation and further discussion.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): The project document was revised, Please address comments on the new document.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Addressed and comment cleared.</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>15th of December 2011 (cseverin0: Yes, the PIF explains clearly how engagement of local communities and proper gender mainstreaming will be key components of the successful implementation of the project.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: Gender dimensions and livelihoods improvements outside the SGP component need to be strengthened during project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). The delivery of socio-economic benefits is not easy to quantify for some of the regional and national policy related and capacity building measures. It is most easily done for components with the on-the ground livelihood measures. It will be important that there will be a solid baseline e.g. the 1000 people to benefits from such livelihood measures. As mentioned earlier, the cost-benefit assessment of these interventions needs to be presented in more detail in the project documentation.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): comment remains. Please address by addressing comments under question 14.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>elaborated in project design.</p> <p>The aim to link with other development partners closely to catalyze a broader set of investments is appreciated.</p> | <p>(4/22/2017). Comment addressed - see QU 14. Cleared.</p> |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | <p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the local communities are foreseen to be properly engaged in the proposed project.</p> <p>However, please do include a stronger explanation how the project seeks to engage with the CSO community.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: The PIF highlights engagement of civil society and strengthening of NGO networks. We are looking forward to seeing this carried through and elaborated in project design.</p> | <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Please do at time of CEO endorsement, include a stronger and more detailed strategy for engagement of the CSO community.</p> <p>(April 13, 2015). Please also more clearly address gender dimensions across all relevant components besides component 4 (community activities).</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Comment remains - especially DRM plans and community project (component 3) need some indication of a strategy and inclusion of sex disaggregated information.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Addressed in the revised document. Please assure attention in MTR reporting to this. Cleared.</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>15th of December 2011 (cseverin); Yes the PIF includes a risk matrix including climatic variability and change as well as a number of suggested mitigation measures.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: the PIF includes a risk matrix. Project design will need to address challenges based on the specific security situation in parts of the basin in</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). Suggest to upgrade the risk rating of risk number 1 /Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at country level. Please explain medium (3 out of 5) risk rating.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>implementation and supervision of on the ground measures.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | <p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): The project will be coordinating its efforts with the Lake Chad Programme implemented by AfDB. However, even though it has been mentioned that deep consultations are planned, please include a suggested mechanism for undertaking these consultations so that it is ensured that they will take place.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: see comments on baseline re link to the GEF funded project implemented by AfDB.</p> <p>Please further elaborate and design an effective coordination mechanisms among on going activities to build on and harness synergies and avoid overlap with e.g BGR, EU, GIZ - funded projects/efforts.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). The project relates to activities by GIZ, BGR and AfDB PRODIBAL. While a designated component was included for alignment and finance of studies for finance by AFDB and WB in the PIF there is less obvious of an alignment of this in the prodoc. Please explain cooperation and coordination with AfDB and WB and/or others.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): UNDP, GIZ and AfDB fielded a number of coordination calls during the PPG phase and held a physical meeting to produce a coordination matrix. There is also clear support by the projects to improve LCBCs capacity for donor coordination.</p> <p>- Please ask for a revised co-financing letter of LCBC. Currently it remains to include the AfDB finance (PRESIBALT) as co-finance for the UNDP project which is not correct and is co-finance to the AfDB GEF project.</p> <p>- Furthermore, the LCBC letter lists the GIZ and BGR support which is also listed in the letter by GIZ. This appears to result in double-counting of that support. Please address.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | (4/22/2017). Comment addressed with re to co-financing letter. For additional comments for coordination during implementation see comments under qu.14. Cleared. |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | <p>15ht of December (2011): (Cseverin): The arrangement has not been explained in detail, please include.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: above comment still holds and should be elaborated during project design (by CEO endorsement - incl. the roles of LCBC, UNESCO, link with BGR, etc.)</p> | <p>(April 13, 2015). The project will be executed by LCBC which is strengthening LCBC's capacity for handling substantial finance and for project execution. As such the combination and co-execution between LCBC and UNESCO envisioned at PIF stage appeared to provide solid backstopping to transfer capacity to LCBC. Given that LCBC is now envisioned to be the single executing agency, please attach a UNDP assessment of LCBC fiduciary and RM capacity and experience to handle funds of this amount.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): the project management arrangements are spelled out in Annex 6. It mentions that the UNDP and AfDB project will attend each other's PSC/project board meetings. It is not clear if that pertains solely to the project manager's of each project. Please also seriously consider to provide formal space/provision for AfDB to be invited as an observer (!) to the PSC (and vice versa).</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | (April 13, 2015). Please see previous comments requesting additional explanation of deviation from PIF outcomes and deliverables. (4/22/2017). Comment addressed in CEO endorsement memo. Cleared. |
| | 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? | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project management budget is accordance with the GEF budgetary guidance. <hr/> (9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: see above. | (April 13, 2015). Yes, project management costs are adequate. |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the funding and associated co-financing seems to be adequate to undertake the suggested activities. However, there please check the focal area strategy framework for consistency with the numbers provided for co-financing in project framework as well as co-financing table. further, please also check for consistency between the amount of requested GEF grant mentioned in the project framework compared to amount listed in the table on the amount requested by agency from the focal area. | (April 13, 2015). Please submit the missing letters of co-finance including all cash and in-kind. As per previous comment especially assure that co-finance letters from GIZ and BGR confirm the deliverables that were at PIF stage envisioned to be delivered by GEF finance. Please note that the LCBC letter lists in-kind (staff time, office space etc) as cash contributions. Please clarify. (10/17/2016): Please see earlier comments on the LCBC letter of co-finance (see question 19.) |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): addressed</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please address inconsistency in numbers of co-finance and addition of numbers in PIF tables. - Please keep total project grant amount within amount endorsed by the countries. <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed in revised PIF.</p> | (4/22/2017). Comment on LCBC co-finance addressed. |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin); the suggested co-financing is presently at 1:5.3, which is considered to be in accordance with the budgetary guidance. | <p>(April 13, 2015). See above.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Country co-finance letters are substantial. As it is impossible to see from the letters of co-finance, please provide a simple overview of the projects referred to in these letters (simple table with name of project, implementation time frame - which needs to align with the current project for endorsement - and source of finance).</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Summary of country parallel co-finance provided. Please submit the co-finance letter for Cameroon which is still missing.</p> |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the | 15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, | (April 13, 2015). UNDP is providing |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | the co-financing is in line with the agency's role, and even seem to be considerable higher than what is normally expected from the agency in question. | substantial in-kind co-finance. Please confirm composition. (10/17/2016): Addressed. This is a mix of trac and parallel co-finance from CapNet. |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | (April 13, 2015). Yes, the IW tracking tool has been submitted, yet targets are low (e..g 25 ha per country in catchment protection). (10/17/2016): TT has been submitted. Please revise/explain indicator in row 8 which currently lists conjunctive management as "not applicable". (4/25/2017) - Revised tracking tool was submitted today. |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | (April 13, 2015). Yes, included. |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? | | (April 13, 2015). STAP response has been "consent" with the overall proposal. Yet the change in scope would require to be addressed by UNDP to GEF Sec and STAP (see earlier comments). (10/17/2016): addressed. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? | | (10/17/2016): addressed. (4/22/2017). Please note that the UNDP |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | took on board and acknowledged the comment from Japan to draw on lessons and build on the projects listed in the Council comment. UNDP confirmed that this will be addressed during project implementation. Please show this will /has been done in upcoming PIRs and/or the MTR. Cleared. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? | | Please confirm that this draft endorsement package has been shared with AfDB. (4/22/2017). Yes. Cleared. |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): No, there is a number of issues that needs to be cleared up prior to PIF approval can be recommended. Please see reviewsheet.</p> <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Yes, as the last remaining points will be addressed at time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>18th of January 2012 (cseverin): No, the project is not a priority at the moment considering the extensive programme recently approved on Lake Chad.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - revised PIF: The scope of PIF and link with partners - including UNESCO and the World</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Bank - aims to deliver the base for considerable investments and impacts in the basin. Some 22 million people in the region are dependent on the water resources of the basin and dramatically reduced Lake levels are a grave concern for environment and livelihoods of people in the region.</p> <p>Please submit revised PIF addressing comments under questions 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 24 (with exceptions of those comments that are indicated to be addressed during project design).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): The comments have been addressed in the revised PIF and additional details will be further elaborated in project design.</p> <p>The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for possible inclusion in a future work program.</p> | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | Please address comments raised in questions/issues indicated to be addressed at CEO endorsements as elaborated under questions 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. | |
| 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>(April 13, 2015). 121 K spent, 179 committed.</p> <p>(4/22/2017). Yes, PPG usage has been reported on in the cover memo.</p> |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | <p>(April 13, 2015). CEO endorsement is not recommended yet. Please address comments raised in the resubmission.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>We also offer and encourage to discuss with UNDP directly to discuss deviation from PIF stage to prodoc noting and acknowledging the challenges in the sub-region.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): Please address the few remaining comments. Please do not hesitate to get in touch for any questions/clarifications.</p> <p>(4/25/2017). Note yet. The IW tracking tool was submitted today. The letter of co-finance from Cameroon is still missing. Please submit.</p> <p>(5/8/2017). The co-finance letter has been submitted.</p> <p>Please note the comments in the review sheet for items to be addressed during implementation (within inception phase and/or by midterm of the project).</p> <p>The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.</p> |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | | April 13, 2015 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | April 09, 2013 | October 16, 2016 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | April 12, 2013 | April 25, 2017 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | May 08, 2017 |
| | 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.