



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

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5057 | | |
| Country/Region: | St. Lucia | | |
| Project Title: | Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Multi Focal Area |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$162,727 | Project Grant: | \$2,331,818 |
| Co-financing: | \$5,018,881 | Total Project Cost: | \$7,513,426 |
| PIF Approval: | October 02, 2012 | Council Approval/Expected: | November 15, 2012 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Ian Gray | Agency Contact Person: | Kristin Mclaughlin |

| 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? | Aug 15 2012 AWV Yes, St. Lucia has ratified the CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD. | October 10, 2014 As at PIF stage. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Aug 15 2012 AWV The OFP endorsed the project on July 25, 2012. | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | Aug 15 2012 AWV The Agency's comparative advantage is adequate. | October 10, 2014 As at PIF stage. |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | Aug 15 2012 AWV No, there is not. | October 10, 2014 As at PIF stage. |

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

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

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

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | Aug 15 2012 AWV NA - UNEP does not have staff in country. Staff from UNEP's office in Jamaica, Panama, and RONA (Washington, DC) will contribute to oversight of this project. | October 10, 2014 As at PIF stage. |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | Aug 15 2012 AWV & IG Yes, the proposed grant is within the resources in St. Lucia's FA allocations. St. Lucia is also a flexible country. If the amount of the PPG grant is included in resources from the FA allocations, the total allocated from FA allocations is over the \$2 million needed to draw on core SFM resources. | October 10, 2014 Requested amounts remain as at PIF stage. |
| | • the focal area allocation? | Aug 15 2012 AWV & IG Resources remain within each of the focal areas. Funding is still available in the SFM set-aside. | October 10, 2014 Requested amounts remain as at PIF stage. |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | NA | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | NA | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | NA | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | NA | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | Sept 12 2012: AWV The problems identified with the outcomes, outputs, and indicators in | October 10, 2014 Project is aligned with FA frameworks. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>Table A outlined below have been resolved. We clear on this item.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWV & IG & MBurke</p> <p>Yes, the project is aligned with the focal area results framework, but expected output measurements (e.g. carbon benefits, the area of new and existing PAs) should be included in the expected outputs column in Table A.</p> <p>For objective CC5, we request that more detailed information on carbon benefits be included, consistent with the focal area results framework, for the outcomes and outputs sections. For example, targets appropriate for either outcomes 5-1 or 5.2 should be listed.</p> <p>Under SFM, because the text lists enhanced carbon sinks, we ask the Agency to consider switching this to Outcome 1.2 under this objective.</p> <p>Under Table B, please include the units of the carbon benefits. Is this tons of CO2 or CO2eq?.</p> | |
| | <p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p> | <p>Sept 12, 2012 AWV</p> <p>UNEP has shifted the objectives and targets to the LD-2 objective as requested.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWV & MIB</p> <p>Yes, the PIF identifies the relevant focal</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Yes the relevant FA Objectives are identified: BD-1, BD-2, CCM-5, LD-2 and SFM/REDD-1.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>area objectives, but that for Land Degradation the objective be changed to LD-2, which focuses on dryland forest landscapes. This is appropriate for this project and it will form a strong alignment with the SFM component, either SFM-1 or 2.</p> | |
| | <p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p> | <p>Sept 12, 2012 AWW</p> <p>The project is consistent with St. Lucia's NPFE, and we thank UNEP for its explanations and for the changes that have enhanced the project's focus.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>Yes, the project is consistent with the NPFE that St. Lucia finalized in January 2012. The GEF Secretariat is pleased that St. Lucia undertook an NPFE exercise to get broader buy-in for the use of GEF funding. As the GEF Secretariat had commented earlier to the GEF OFP, however, the final NPFE lacked sufficient focus and contained a great number of objectives and sub-projects for the limited amount of funding available. The GEF Secretariat understands the reasons for this. UNEP has performed a valuable role in helping bring greater focus to the project, but the Secretariat believes some further narrowing of focus would be beneficial in order to increase the likelihood of project success. Please see comment 14 below. We would be happy to discuss this with UNEP.</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Yes The PAD details consistency with NBSAP, NAP, NAPA, 2nd National Communication, NIP, PRSP and NPFD.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p> | <p>Sept 12, 2012 AWW</p> <p>Thank you for the further explanation as to how the proposal will build capacity so as to make the mainstreaming of biodiversity into land use planning more sustainable. We clear on this.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>As discussed below, we believe this project needs to be better focused around the key objectives of (1) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into land use planning (and economic sectors), (2) the strengthening of protected areas, and (3) sustainable land and forest management (e.g. both LD-2 and SFM-1). There are some activities in the proposal that take away from this focus, and we are not convinced that funding allocated to build capacity in the key areas mentioned above is sufficient. The proposal needs to more clearly articulate how sustainable capacity will be developed in the areas of land-use planning so that this can form the basis for greater (national level) action in the future.</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Local capacities will be developed through engagement with Ministry staff in terms of land use planning, enhanced SLM practices and management of PAs. Local community capacity building will be result of Component 4 in production of biodiversity friendly goods and services.</p> |
| | <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>Sept 12, 2012 AWW</p> <p>With the changes to the PIF and explanations provided by UNEP, the baseline is sufficiently described and the data and assumptions appear sound.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Description of the baseline situation and the problems the project is addressing is adequate.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| Project Design | | We believe that the baseline with regard to the status of land-use planning and management of the protected areas (forest and marine reserves) is sufficient. The baseline is not sufficiently described with regard to invasive alien species (2.B) and the component on "sustainable use of BD" (component 3) in the project, but as noted below, we believe that UNEP and St. Lucia should consider dropping these. | |
| | 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? | | October 10, 2014 Approach is appropriate for this multi-objective MFA. |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning? | <p>Sept 12, 2012 AWW</p> <p>The activities are based on incremental reasoning, and UNEP has described how the research and monitoring program is also incremental. We clear on this.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>Yes, the activities are based on incremental reasoning. But one request:</p> <p>-- B.2 Incremental/Additional Cost reasoning. Component 2. A. last bullet. Please provide more information on the research and monitoring program and more supportive reasoning on why this is incremental compared to what is going on already.</p> | October 10, 2014 Baseline programs identified. Reasoning adequate. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>Sept 12, 2012 AWV</p> <p>UNEP has provided sufficient answers and/or made modifications to address the concerns raised below with regard to land-use planning, protected areas, and ecosystem restoration.....</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWV, IG, MIB</p> <p>As mentioned above, St. Lucia's NPF included a great many objectives, and this PIF is a step in the right direction in terms of narrowing the focus into a solid project, but we believe greater focus is needed for this to be a successful project. We there are also important questions as to whether funding is being allocated appropriately to the different objectives.</p> <p>1. Land-use planning component & Mainstreaming: we believe that this is one of the strongest aspects of this project. (In fact, the project seems more like a mainstreaming project than a PA/BD-1 project.) If St. Lucia is not able to manage land-use in a way that is ecologically sustainable, its overall economic development will suffer as it is heavily dependent on tourism and natural resources. We would like UNEP to explain more clearly whether sufficient funding is allocated to this component so that sustainable capacity will be built.</p> <p>In line with comments 3 and 4 below,</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Project framework clear.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>we are surprised that there is not a greater emphasis on mainstreaming biodiversity into the main productive sectors, including tourism and fisheries. We encourage UNEP and St. Lucia to improve the project with regard to its mainstreaming into these sectors, rather than using funding on small (and potentially unsustainable) components regarding invasive species and biodiversity friendly products.</p> <p>2. Interventions in PAs - The PIF states that \$1 million will be allocated to BD-1, but it is not clear how this funding will be used and how management effectiveness of PAs will be increased. There are two things that UNEP could consider doing. Either break out component 2 into separate components dealing with (1) mainstreaming/SFM/LD and (2) PAs - both marine and terrestrial. Or, it should more clearly separate out and describe the components and use of funding in its description of component 2. In this later regard, we would like to see how much funding is for PAs under component 2.A and we believe that component 2.C is also a PA component. Please clarify the surface area of PAs to be improved, and include in table A.</p> <p>3. Ecosystem restoration: (a) Please include a statement that only non-BD resources will be used in restoration as restoration is not an objective for BD under the GEF-5 FA objectives. (b) In</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>table B, please clarify whether that the 10,000 ha mentioned is the overall landscape area in which the 1,157 ha will be restored. (c) Please include a very brief description of how restoration will be attempted and how local communities will be involved.</p> <p>4. Private Concessions: Please explain how the mechanism to establish 2 private concessions to raise revenue for the forest department will work. How will revenues be raised actually and how will this be returned to the forest department rather than the central Treasury. A range of financial mechanisms is offered as potential approaches including tax incentives, but please explain how the Ministry of Finance will be involved, as this would seem essential.</p> <p>5. Invasives component: This component, listed as "joint forest/fisheries" does not seem to fit together or within the overall project well. The GEF-5 BD strategy emphasizes strengthening IAS management policies and frameworks with a particular focus on detection, prevention, and management of new invasions rather than management and control of existing invasives, which is not cost-effective. Further, a sub-national approach on an island like St. Lucia would not seem effective as new individuals will simply move into the NE to replace individuals eliminated.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>We will need further explanation as to how the IAS component is consistent with the GEF-5 strategy or we recommend eliminating this component until a more national approach can be taken. This would also allow the project to focus more on mainstreaming at sector and land-use planning levels.</p> <p>6. Component 3 (sustainable use of BD): We understand that this is a priority for the OFP, but it does not seem to fit well within the project. As currently described, the markets for the products mentioned do not seem mature enough to enable sustainable industries in the products to be established. We would need to see a greater demonstration of demand for these products to convince us that the interventions will be sustainable. We believe that this GEF funding could produce greater impact by focusing more on improving land-use planning and mainstreaming in key sectors rather than focusing on what appear to be rather small markets. We would like to discuss changing the project in this way with UNEP.</p> <p>If this component is to move forward, it would seem necessary to incorporate some supply-side incentives in the production process to enhance grower and collector involvement in the management processes. Even then, the GEF Secretariat remains skeptical that this part of the project will succeed.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| | <p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>Sept 12, 2012</p> <p>We believe UNEP has sufficiently addressed the concerns with regard to component 2.B and Component 3.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>See comments in #14 above. We have doubts about assumptions and methodology with regard to component 2.B and Component 3.</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Incremental reasoning clear.</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>Sept 12, 2012</p> <p>UNEP has clarified how our concerns are satisfied. We clear.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>The socio-economic benefits section is adequate, but it does not emphasize the main socio-economic benefit arising from this project, which will be its contribution to securing a sustainable ecological basis for the main industry of St. Lucia, which is tourism. Protection of nature is essential for maintenance and continued development of the tourism sector. It is also key to the fisheries sector.</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Socio-economic benefits are largely extensive accruing to the local populations from improved management of the project area particularly from improved management of NTFPs and tourism-related activities relating to Components 3 and 4. The overall thrust of the project remains however to secure ecosystem services necessary for sustainable development.</p> |
| | <p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p> | <p>Aug 15 2012 AWW</p> <p>Yes - and the project is being developed in the context of the improved participation brought about through the NPFE, which was developed with participation from outside of the St. Lucian Government.</p> | <p>October 10, 2014</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement and participation will be managed through the project's stakeholder participation plan.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | 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) | Aug 15 2012 AWV Yes, climate change risks are mentioned. | October 10, 2014 Key potential risks are considered and mitigation approaches are proposed. |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Aug 15 2012 AWV The description of coordination with other projects is very strong. | October 10, 2014 Coordination appropriate. |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | Aug 15 2012 AWV Yes, it seems adequate as several UNEP offices will be involved in assisting the project. | October 10, 2014 Arrangements appear appropriate. |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | October 10, 2014 Changes are limited and adequately supported. |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | October 10, 2014 There is no non-grant instrument. |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | Aug 15 2012 AWV Yes, project management costs are at 5% of the total. | October 10, 2014 PMC remains at 5%. |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | Aug 15, 2012 AWV Please see comments in #14. We believe that funding for the mainstreaming components of the project, and lack of clear focus on main productive sectors, might be too low to achieve project objectives. | October 10, 2014 Funding levels appear adequate. |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | Aug 15 2012 AWV Project co-financing is adequate. | October 10, 2014 Project co-finance has reduced to \$5,018,881. While this is unfortunate, the rationale supporting is acceptable. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | Sept 12, 2012 AWW UNEP has explained what constitutes its in-kind cofinancing Aug 15 2012 AWW UNEP is only bringing \$200,000 in kind to the project. In the PIF, please describe what this constitutes and what the source is. | October 10, 2014 UNEP co-finance remains at \$200,000. |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | October 10, 2014 SFM TT please reconsider the Avoided deforestation area and GHG estimate. 10,000 ha of avoided deforestation seems high and is not supported in the Annex on GHG calculations. CC TT please complete the areas required in cells C/147-150. November 22, 2014 TTs revised. Cleared. |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | October 10, 2014 Yes budgeted M&E plan available. |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | NA | October 10, 2014 STAP comments on forest animals and reptiles, land use planning approaches, the links between tourism and agriculture, gender and risks have been appropriately responded to. |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | NA | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | NA | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | <p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p> | <p>Sept 13, 2012 AWV, IG, MIB, MBurke</p> <p>We believe UNEP and St. Lucia have adequately responded to our concerns.</p> <p>This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>Aug 15 2012 AWV</p> <p>We believe this project has strong potential to help St. Lucia sustainably manage natural resources in the north-east region so as to produce global environmental benefits in terms of biodiversity, land and forest management, climate mitigation and adaptation. We particularly like the land-use management focus. The project represents a positive step forward in terms of narrowing the focus of its NPDF, but we believe clearer focus on components dealing with mainstreaming, management of PAs, and sustainable land and forest management is needed to heighten changes for project success.</p> <p>Accordingly we request that the changes mentioned in sections #7, 8, 10, 14, and 16 be made. The changes in #14 are particularly important. We would be happy to discuss these proposed changes, particularly those in 14, in a meeting with UNEP.</p> <p>Some additional, necessary changes:</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>1. Please change the amount of the Agency fee in Part 1 to "\$233,182", so that it matches the amount listed in the total in Part D.</p> <p>2. Part II Justification â€œ A.1.1. for CC strategy, please add more specific information regarding hectares.</p> <p>3. Please include a sentence for each of the related policy directives (for the UNFCCC) and priorities in the NPDF and how the project addresses them.</p> <p>4. In the Project overview, please list a reference for the source of the estimate for the C stored in the Forest Reserves and outside the Forest Reserves?</p> <p>5. If possible, please do the same for the estimate of vulnerability for forests outside of the reserve?</p> <p>6. Under Global Environmental Benefits, Climate change and SFM, please list the units for CO2 sequestration and information on how the values were calculated.</p> <p>In Table B.4. please explain "M" in middle column indicates.</p> <p>We</p> | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | Sept 13 2012 Mburke | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>1. In the PPG grant proposal, please provide details on how the monitoring framework will be developed. Please explain what kind of information will be obtained and how it will be used to inform land use planning decisions, policy, and regulation, particularly as it relates to carbon sequestration and emissions avoidance.</p> <p>2. For the final CEO endorsement document, please explain how calculations for carbon estimates are calculated for Component 2. Currently, values are given without explanation of how they were obtained, and as a result it is difficult to evaluate assumptions.</p> <p>3. Please provide a clearer picture of what the situation would be without the GEF investment. In particular, please describe the incremental value of the monitoring program in terms of both biodiversity and carbon benefits.</p> <p>AWV</p> <p>4. UNEP's office in Panama is supervising several projects in Latin America (for example, two in Mexico) that seek to mainstream biodiversity conservation into land-use planning and economic development activities. The final project document should discuss how UNEP will ensure that this expertise and lessons-learned are shared with the St. Lucia project.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | 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? | | October 10, 2014 Details of financing status of PPG provided. |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | October 10, 2014 Not at this point. Please revise SFM and CC TTs. |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | August 15, 2012 | October 10, 2014 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 13, 2012 | November 22, 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? | Dec 5, 2012 Yes, the proposed activities for project preparation and program coordination are appropriate. They will fund the necessary components for land use planning that mainstreams biodiversity and other ecosystem services, including carbon sequestration benefits, needed preparatory action for SFM activities and associated carbon monitoring, and preparation for biodiversity friendly production activities. |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | Dec 5, 2012 The total budget is \$179,000, and the contributions for each component/activity is appropriate. |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Dec 5, 2012 Yes, we recommend this PPG for approval. |
| | 4. Other comments | Dec 5, 2012 |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Review Date (s) | First review* | December 05, 2012 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | |

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.