



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

|  |  |                              |                   |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 5544   |                              |                   |
| Country/Region:                            | Marshall Islands   |                              |                   |
| Project Title:                             | R2R Reimaanlok Looking to the Future: Strengthening Natural Resource Management in Atoll Communities in the Republic of Marshall Islands Employing Integrated Approaches (RMI R2R) |                              |                   |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 5685 (UNDP)       |
| 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; IW-3;  |                              |                   |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$150,000  | Project Grant:               | \$3,927,981       |
| Co-financing:                              | \$4,057,139  | Total Project Cost:          | \$8,285,120       |
| PIF Approval:                              | September 14, 2015   | Council Approval/Expected:   | October 21, 2015  |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                   |
| Program Manager:                           | Sarah Wyatt  | Agency Contact Person:       | Jose Erez Padilla |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility     | 1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?               | <p>UNCCD: Date of Ratification: June 02 1998; Effective Date: August 31 1998</p> <p>UNCBD: signed 1992-06-12; Marshall Islands became a Party on 1992-10-08.</p> <p>UNFCCC: Date of signature: 12 June 1992; Date of ratification: 08 October 1992; Date of entry into force: 21 March 1994</p> | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |
|                 | 2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project? | - A letter is dated August 31, 2012. The letter is signed by the Minister in charge of the Environment Portfolio and cosigned by the political and the operational focal points.  | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>- Please note that the project title is different. This letter is for a project entitled "Strengthening NRM and RE in Atoll communities in the Republic of Marshall Islands under the Framework of the Micronesia Challenge as elaborated in the Reimaanlok". Please, clarify.</p> <p>- A new letter seems necessary, with the right title and the endorsement of the IW resources.</p> <p>- However, the letter is interesting as there is a clear request to focus on three strategic objectives related to Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation, and Land Degradation. Some strategic guidance is also given that can be useful (protection of sites of high BD values, benefits in terms of carbon sequestration, targeted protection of mangrove sites, food security, effective management of PA through community agreements). We would like to invite UNEP to better reflect these aspects in simplifying deeply the project.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Please provide a new letter of endorsement from the GEF focal point including the endorsement of the IW resources and without mention of LD resources since LD is not part of the project anymore.</p> <p>FJ - June 23, 2014:<br/>Please provide a letter of endorsement</p> |  |

| Review Criteria       | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|                       |  | <p>including the endorsement of the IW resources requested.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The Letter of Endorsement along with the email documenting the agency change provides documentation of the country's support for this project.</p>   |  |
| Resource Availability | <p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):</p> |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>   | <p>Please, check the resources in the Program Framework Document (PFD) approved by the Council. These figures should be reflected in the PIF:</p> <p>BD: \$1,761,468<br/> LD: \$412,844<br/> CC: \$1,743,119</p> <p>The sum of the project grant planned in the PFD (\$4,077,981) and the fees (\$367,018) reaches \$4,445,000. With the endorsement of all STAR allocations from the country (\$4,520,000), \$75,000 is available for a PPG (fees included).</p> <p>FJ - Feb 13, 2014:<br/> The total GEF funding requested (\$4,408,996 including Agency fees and PPG) is slightly lower than the amount mentioned in the R2R program (\$4,445,000). Please clarify since, the end of GEF-5 coming soon, you may want to request the total sum allocated at the PFD stage.</p> | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  | <p>FJ - June 23, 2014:<br/>           Yes. The total GEF funding requested (\$4,444,246 including Agency fees and PPG) is in line with the amount mentioned in the R2R program (\$4,445,000).</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015<br/>           Yes. The project budget including PPG matches what has been allocated through the R2R parent project.</p>  |  |
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>                       | Yes.  | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul> | NA  | NA   |
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>    | NA  | NA   |
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>              | NA  | NA   |
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>                            | <p>- Please note that \$160,550 should be included in the budget, as planned in the PFD. Please make sure that IW activities are consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5. These activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities. Please do ensure that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island</p> | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes, for IW.</p>                  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
|                 |           | <p>Countries".</p> <p>- Unfortunately, no SFM/REDD+ resources have been programmed for this PIF. Please remove the budget and the related objectives.</p> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>The request fits with the agreement reached at the PFD stage for IW allocation. Please make sure that activities are included in the PIF on the small IW increment, consistent with IW objective 3 under GEF-5. Further ensure that activities will support action toward facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities. Furthermore, please do ensure that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island Countries".</p> <p>CG - June 23, 2014: Not addressed. Table B/ component 4, please include the following sentence: "these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in</p> |  |

| Review Criteria                   | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)                       |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                   |   | <p>Pacific Island Countries".</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The request fits the amounts allocated for IW for RMI in the PFD.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Strategic Alignment</b></p> | <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?<br/> <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p> | <p>No.</p> <p>Once the project reasoning will have been revised, please simplify the table A and the number of Focal Area objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The BD4 and BD5 do not seem relevant for this R2R approach.</li> <li>- The SFM/REDD+1 and 2 should be removed.</li> <li>- A last line for management costs is acceptable, but not the formulation that is proposed ("OEPCC Project Management and Technical Support and Capacity Development).</li> <li>- The presence of three LD objectives and two CC objectives need to be justified.</li> </ul> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014:<br/> The main objective of the project is in line with BD-1 and BD-2 strategy, however further clarification on the expected outcomes will have to be provided as requested in Item 7. The Aichi targets that the project will help to achieve have been identified. SMART indicators have not been identified, please develop them in accordance to the expected outcomes presented in Table B. Tentative baseline and target have to be provided for each indicator.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/> This question will be reviewed once the</p> | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes, there are clear linkages to the Aichi Targets.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  | <p>other comments have been cleared.</p> <p>CG/IW+BD - June 23, 2014: BD component of Table B Please simplify Table B.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014: This question will be reviewed once the other comments have been cleared.</p> <p>SW - July 28, 2015</p> <p>Yes. This project has chosen to focus on a limited set of objectives where it can have a real impact - BD 1 and 2 and IW 3.2. They clearly list the project's relationship to the Aichi Targets.</p> |  |
|                 | <p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p> | <p>No. This section will need to be revisited after the revision of project design.</p> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014: The project is consistent with national strategies related to biodiversity conservation and biodiversity mainstreaming, including the Reimaanlok action plan.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014: Yes for CCM issues.</p> <p>SW - July 28, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>   | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |
|                 | <p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and</p>                             | <p>No. The reasoning has to be fully revised. Please, note that the length that is recommended for a PIF is 10 pages (the current proposal is 26 page long). Revise the reasoning, be concise and focused.</p>  | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |

| Review Criteria | Questions    | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--------------|---|--|
| Project Design  | assumptions? | <p>General problems are listed, but we do not catch the logical reasoning with the description of problems, what is done by the baseline projects, and how the GEF is going to be used for incremental activities, eligible under GEF5 strategies. Revise this reasoning in the pages 10-18.</p> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>The project needs to significantly improve the baseline regarding the biodiversity status and related on-going initiatives. Please provide a comprehensive overview of the actions implemented through the Reimaanlok plan, the situation of the PA network (number of PA, legal status, METT, financial scorecard). Please further detail the status of the national legal framework regarding biodiversity conservation and biodiversity mainstreaming (strength and gap). List the major related initiatives and indicate their budget. Because the GEF has already funded projects with similar goals, please present the achieved outcomes of those projects and how the project will build on them. These elements will help to understand the project incremental value.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>No.<br/>a) The PIF only briefly mentions the high dependence on fossil-fuel and its cost and list related national objectives, policies, initiatives and project. Please describe (i) what the existing initiatives and policies have already achieved in terms of</p> |  |



| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>renewable energy development, energy efficiency and low carbon transport development, and (ii) why GEF support is needed on top of the existent initiatives (what GEF funding will enable to do that could not be achieved otherwise). Please clarify in particular how the proposed project will ensure complementarity and avoid overlapping with the project ADMIRE.</p> <p>b) Please also clarify the type of climate change mitigation technologies and investment the project intends to support and justify the selected technologies and investments.</p> <p>CG/IW+BD - June 23, 2014:<br/> Previous comment has been partly addressed. Information on PAN and related on-going activities has been provided. Baseline related to component 1 activities needs further improvement. It is unclear how the past/on-going activities have concretely contributed to the Action Plan implementation and how the proposed GEF project will have an incremental value (besides coordinating these on-going initiatives). To support the baseline logic, it is recommended to focus on initiatives that have a clear link with the project scope.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/> a) The previous comment a) has not been addressed. Some description has been added on how the existing policies require all energy investment to consider resilience to climate change impact and</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
|                 |   | <p>how the sulfur content of diesel has been reduced, but this is more confusing since the added elements relate more to climate change adaptation and local pollution than to climate change mitigation. Besides, the PIF still does not clarify how the proposed project activities will be complementary and avoid overlapping with the activities of project ADMIRE. Please address the previous comment a). b) With \$1.7 million of GEF CCM funding and \$1.35 million of co-financing, the list of targeted low-GHG technologies seems too long for the project to ensure a sustained impact. Please see Q7.</p> <p>SW - July 28, 2015</p> <p>Yes, the detail is sufficient for the PIF stage and we look forward to further analysis by CEO Endorsement.</p> |  |
|                 | <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>A result framework presented in 6 pages, with 7 components, 17 outcomes, and 33 outputs is not realistic and cannot be acceptable. It reflects a deep problem of project reasoning and formulation.</p> <p>- The component 1 is about water and does not seem eligible under BD and LD objectives.</p> <p>- A component 2 related to food security and ecosystem services is welcome, but the reasoning should be developed: what the cofinancing is used for, what the added value of the GEF grant is, explain</p>   | <p>April 13, 2017</p> <p>The project is strong overall, but there are some issues that need to addressed.</p> <p>Ramsar - The GEF does not fund the preparation of documents for Ramsar designation. Please remove these activities from the project.</p> <p>GIS system - Who will be responsible for maintaining and updating this system after project completion?</p> <p>Scaling-up - GEF resources should not be considered for scaling up activities.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
|                 |           | <p>in the text what you want to achieve through these outputs, develop the activities, provide in the table B quantified and concrete outputs, with simple indicators (# of ha under SLM, under agroforestry, etc).</p> <p>- A component 3 around the outcome 3.2 is welcome. However, the budget is very low in regards to the challenges that are proposed. Please refer to outcomes and outputs available in the GEF5 BD strategy. It is not sure that the outcomes 3.3 and 3.4 are appropriate.</p> <p>-Component 4 does not provide the details on the baseline activities regarding renewable energy technologies. This information is necessary to help to inform what the current gaps are and the GEF intervention required.<br/>The activity mentioned in the PIF only relates to updating the energy policy, but does not provide the specific details as to what is the current status of the policy and why it is necessary to update it. Please provide details on the current status of the energy policy.<br/>Please provide details how the updated policy will be implemented and the necessary regulatory instruments which will help to implement it. Also, please clarify the specific activities of the project which will be necessary to ensure the energy policy to be developed under component 4 is implemented.</p> <p>- The proposal should describe the</p> | <p>The provision of IW resources is specifically aimed at the collection of lessons learned and case studies as part of IW Learn. Also, it would be good to talk about how the government or other entities in RMI could scale these activities up.</p> <p>Site profiles - While we know that there is little information available (hence the need for this project), please include the targeted biodiversity at each site, such as an important coral reef or remaining forest. Where known, mentioning threatened or endemic species would be helpful. Lastly, please connect how the activities proposed for that site relate to the conservation of that biodiversity. If any KBAs are present (which is difficult given that they do not have complete marine data yet), please include this information.</p> <p>June 8, 2017</p> <p>No, thank you for the revisions but there are still a few issues that remain.</p> <p>KBAs - The project proponents seem to misunderstand that KBAs are not locally determined sites, but are based on an international standard and presence of threatened species. Please revise the language on KBAs to reflect the IUCN standard for KBAs. It appears that none of the atolls mentioned are in KBAs.</p> <p>Atoll-level activities - While we</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>critical issues in the transport sector in Marshall Islands and how the proposal will respond to them. The proposed activities seem generic. In Component 4, expected outputs should be streamlined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The component 5 should probably be merged with others.</li> <li>- The component 6 is not acceptable - it is a duplication of management costs.</li> </ul> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>At this stage, it is difficult to understand the objective and strategy of the project. Please revise Table B and related text. The number of expected outputs are numerous and not necessarily linked to each other. Please reduce the number of outputs, focus on the most relevant ones, and clearly describe how the project will achieve them. For example, on PA: how many PAs are expected to be created, for which purpose. Regarding the integrated atoll management, poor information is provided; please specify the kind of activities that will be developed (e.g. law harmonization or community pilot activities), and their finality. Please, clarify the scope of the project: how many atolls will be involved, based on which criteria.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>No.<br/>Component 3:<br/>a) The rationale behind the activities proposed for Component 3 needs to be</p> | <p>understand that not every activity has been determined thus far, some of the activities don't appear to be linked to global environmental benefits, such as the construction of a community center. Please revise. Potentially the project could provide information about questions/standards/criteria that will be used to determine which activities the project should support rather than trying to justify every activity in the ProDoc.</p> <p>September 12, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for providing the KBA information and criteria for activity selection. Please ensure that major threats are addressed through these activities (i.e. not choosing to address a minor threat while ignoring the major threats that could be addressed instead).</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>strengthened. Multiple initiatives have been working and are currently supporting mitigation initiative through renewable energy development and in the transport sector. The proposal needs to briefly present these initiatives, what they have achieved, the barriers they have achieved, why they have not been as successful as expected and what lessons the project uses from these past experience to bring an added value and incremental mitigation impact.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the type of CCM technologies the project intends to support. Table B mentions RO solar water purification systems, biogas units, energy efficient coostoves and coconut-biodiesel. It also mentions canoes but fails to specify what will be the mitigation action related to canoes. Please also clarify (i) which technology will be targeting households and which will be targeting businesses; (ii) what is the rationale behind the choice of the proposed technologies and whether they make economic sense; and (iii) what will be the mitigation action related to canoes. Please justify in particular the choice of biogas units, since small scale biogas units are usually very costly and their development difficult to sustain.</p> <p>c) With the limited resources available for CCM, please consider focusing the project on a more limited number of climate change mitigation technologies to ensure stronger impact for these.</p> <p>d) Several past and existing initiatives (including the project ADMIRE) have</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>provided support to clean energy policies and action plans. Please clarify what the proposed project will do in that field that has not been already done or that is not underway. Please specify more precisely the type of policy and action plan the project will target and the rationale behind this choice (e.g. which policy instrument to overcome which barrier).</p> <p>e) Please clarify and justify what the project will support in terms of transport regulation and licensing framework. Would this output focus on vehicle and vessels energy efficiency requirements? If yes, how would this be enforced?</p> <p>f) The PIF includes the design and implementation of a financial scheme for RET. Please clarify (i) the type of scheme the project will develop, (ii) how the scheme would work, (iv) what the scheme financial resources would be and how they would be sustained beyond project completion, and (v) which partner of the project has experience in designing and implementing such scheme.</p> <p>g) Past and existing initiatives include outreach, awareness raising and capacity building on renewable energy (e.g. ADMIRE). Please clarify what the project will do in that domain that has not been already done or is not under implementation. Also, since Component 3 is to be funded by GEF CCM funding, please clarify why outreach support to BD and LD are included in output 3.4.</p> <p>h) The GEF funding allocated to component 3 in Table B is not consistent with the CCM funding request presented</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>in Table A. Please clarify and revise.</p> <p>i) Several activities proposed for Component 3 seem to qualify as INV rather than TA (investments in clean energy technologies, financial scheme). Please clarify and adjust Table B with two rows for Component 3, one for INV and one for TA with the respective outcomes, outputs and financing.</p> <p>FJ+CG+JMS - 23 June 2014:</p> <p>A) This PIF has 31 pages +8 pages of annex (the last submission was 26 pages and we ask for less). The response from UNEP says that the PIF has been extended to meet GEFSEC requests. It is a real problem as most of our comments have not been addressed. Please, understand that we do not need additional information, but a deep revision of the reasoning, the way to explain the project, and at the end, a more focused result framework. For the time being, the project does not reach acceptable GEF standards (incremental reasoning, global environment benefits, eligible outcomes and outputs).</p> <p>B) The result framework is 5 page long, with 13 outcomes and 14 outputs. There is problem of project focus: 1) You have to provide a simpler result framework at concept level that is doable in regards to the available resources and 2) it is recommended to check the OECD's definitions of outcomes and outputs that are applicable within the GEF. The outcomes should reflect the intention that is expected after the project. The</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>outcomes should be expressed as the effects of intervention's outputs. The outputs are the products, capital goods and services which result from the activities. They have to be very concrete, if possible quantified. Please revise the structure of the result framework. Please, revise the formulation of outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:</p> <p>a) to e) Previous comment a) to e) have not been addressed. Please do so.</p> <p>f) Please clarify why Output 3.3 has been deleted from the PIF. Please then address previous comment f) that has not been addressed yet.</p> <p>g) Previous comment g) has not been completely addressed. Past and existing initiatives include outreach, awareness raising and capacity building on renewable energy (e.g. ADMIRE). Please clarify what the project will do in that domain that has not been already done or is not under implementation.</p> <p>h) Cleared.</p> <p>i) The response to comment i) indicates difficulties to differentiate the INV and TA portion of component 3 at this stage. However, the project leaves too many elements for further development and gives the impression that the project key activities are yet to be defined. Please strongly consider (i) reducing the range of low-GHG technologies considered by the project and (ii) addressing comment f) above with the identification of a financing level for the financial scheme</p> |  |



| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>that would make sense in terms of amount for the list of technologies targeted.</p> <p>j) Please note that GEF CCM funding cannot be used for research or education purposes (as proposed under component 3) that do not have a direct impact on GHG mitigation.</p> <p>k) Please clarify the nature of the added paragraphs on energy pages 18-19. Are they a description of Component 3? If this is the case, please note that GEF CCM funding is expected to deliver not just assessments, advocacy or definition of regulations or standards but also to enforce and put in place concrete policies/regulations activities delivering GHG benefits.</p> <p>CG/IW+BD - June 23, 2014:<br/>Not addressed. It is difficult to understand the objective and strategy of the project.</p> <p>Table B: SMART indicator has to be developed for each outcome. Reduce the number of outputs and outcomes; select the ones showing the result/ impact rather than process.</p> <p>Component 1: Table B and the related text need to be better aligned. The text has to provide a clear description of the activities supported by the project and the methodology applied.</p> <p>Component 2: how RMI was able to realize a funding gap analysis for full operationalization of PNA without first realizing the gap analysis of the PA network? The proposal has (i) to explain</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>how the project will raise funding, (ii) METT for each existing and new PA targeted by the project will have to be submitted at CEO endorsement, (iii) justify the project added-value or complementarity with regard to the on-going CMAC project</p> <p>Please revise Table B and related text. The number of expected outputs are numerous and not necessarily linked to each other. Please reduce the number of outputs, focus on the most relevant ones, and clearly describe how the project will achieve them. For example, on PA: how many PAs are expected to be created, for which purpose. Regarding the integrated atoll management, poor information is provided; please specify the kind of activities that will be developed (e.g. law harmonization or community pilot activities), and their finality. Please, clarify the scope of the project: how many atolls will be involved, based on which criteria.</p> <p>Component 4: Please make sure that activities are consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5. These activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities. Please do ensure that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island Countries".</p> <p>JMS/LD - June 23, 2014:<br/> We suggest merging the LD resources either with CC or BD to reduce the burden to deal with 4 focal areas (with IW), their respective GEF strategies, and tracking tools.<br/> We hope it will also be a way to simplify the result framework.<br/> In the proposed PIF, there are discrepancies between the table B (the result framework) and the explanations provided under the part II.<br/> In the table B, the component 1 includes one outcome related to food security and ecosystem services security, however, it is difficult to figure out how the proposed outputs can address this outcome.<br/> In the text (p19) the component 2 is supposed to also include activities related food security and agroforestry (text p19), but the result framework and the rest of the text only refer to protected area management.<br/> It is very difficult to figure out the logical reasoning and understand how the LD resources will be used. We recommend merging the LD resources with BD or CC resources and simplifying the project framework.</p> <p>SW - July 28, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The activities described in Table B</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
|                 |  | are sufficiently detailed and appropriate for the national context.  |  |
|                 | <p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>No.<br/>Please describe the reasoning and the expected global benefits.<br/>Revise the sections p. 16-17-18.<br/>Do not repeat the information provided in the other sections (project description for instance).<br/>Please provide an incremental reasoning explaining 1) the problems the project seeks to address, 2) the baseline scenario and what is done by the cofinancing, and 3) justify the incremental role of the GEF, describing the global environment benefits (notably biodiversity, Sustainable Land Management, Climate Change Mitigation).<br/>- Please provide estimation of CO2e emissions that is expected to be reduced through the project activities stating assumptions.</p> <p>CG - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>At this stage, the incremental reasoning is not clear. This item will be considered based on the revised proposal.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Once comments of Q7 will be addressed, please provide an initial estimation of CO2e emissions that is expected to be reduced through the project activities and briefly explain how the estimation has been done.</p> | <p>April 14, 2107</p> <p>The global environmental benefits have been outlined but please include the information requested about each site.</p> <p>Sustainable financing - Will the financing mechanism provide resources to the trust fund? It is disappointing that the scoping study could not be undertaken during PPG as requested at PIF approval, so that planning could already be under way. STAP has noted that GEF projects often propose sustainable financing activities but often do not end up implementing them. How will this project ensure that the mechanism is established and lasting by the end of the project?</p> <p>Sustainability of training - Often once people are trained with more advanced degrees, they receive opportunities that take them away from the places they are supposed to be building the capacity of. How will this project work to keep scholarship recipients working in RMI?</p> <p>June 8, 2017</p> <p>No, thank you for the helpful information on scholarships.</p> <p>Sustainable financing - The MCT exists as a sustainable financing mechanism</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
|                 |   | <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/>The previous comment has not been addressed. Please address Q7 and provide an initial estimation of CO2e emissions that is expected to be reduced through the project activities and briefly explain how the estimation has been done. At this stage, there is no need for detailed estimation. Please provide an initial estimation with available data.</p> <p>CG/ IW+BD- June 23, 2014:<br/>The incremental reasoning is still weak. This item will be reconsidered based on the responses provided to the other comments.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The information provided in this section is sufficient for the PIF stage; however, more detail will be required at CEO Endorsement. In particular, sustainable finance mechanisms will need to be identified by CEO Endorsement.</p> | <p>for RMI. At this point in project development, we would have expected that the sustainable financing mechanism to be undertaken would already be identified and some of the steps needed to implement it outlined. If it's establishing a program (say a hotel tax) that would provide resources for the MCT that would also work. STAP has recognized that sustainable financing mechanisms is a particular weakness of projects if they are not outlined by this point. Please provide more information.</p> <p>September 12, 2017</p> <p>Yes, thank you for the revisions and explanation about the options available for RMI and the blue fee.</p> <p>Throughout project implementation, please focus on the actual implementation of initiatives not only studies or plans that require further funding for implementation.</p> |
|                 | <p>9. Is there a clear description of:<br/>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and<br/>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p> |   | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, this project demonstrates socio-economic benefits and gender responsive design.</p>   |
|                 | <p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>  | <p>There is a long list of potential participants, but we did not find any information on how the public will be involved, including the Civil Society Organizations (CSO), the local</p>   | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, thank you.</p>  |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
|                 |  | <p>communities and traditional authorities.</p> <p>FJ - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Cleared</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>   |   |
|                 | <p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p> | <p>A list of risks is provided. During the PPG, please include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Past initiatives have shown failures of some local partners to sustain agreed upon financial scheme (e.g. the fee system to cover battery replacement of PV installations under the Cotonou Agreement). For the financial scheme of Component 3, please clarify the financial and political commitment of the local partners and how the project will ensure the scheme may be sustained beyond project completion.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/>The removal of the financing scheme activities leaves the CCM part of the project without activities focused on the actual delivery of climate change mitigation benefits. This puts the CCM funding justification in question, as CCM funding needs to be associated with the delivery of GHG benefits that would not be possible without GEF support. Please clarify and consider revising the project activities under Component 3.</p> | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, the project in particular has thought about the communications challenges presented by working in such remote places.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  | <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. There are some significant challenges identified based on the national context, but their recognition and mitigation strategies are appropriate.</p>  |  |
|                 | <p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>A deeper and more comprehensive analysis of related initiatives in the country and in the region is absolutely necessary at PIF level. It will be a great help to revise the reasoning of the project, avoid duplication with other projects, and develop synergy. Please check notably the GEF portfolio under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability. Check also the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- #5195 GEF/UNEP "Building national and regional capacities to implement MEA in the Pacific Islands", GEF \$4,319 million.</li> <li>- The pending GEF/UNEP project named "Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the countries of Pacific", GEF NPIF \$2 million.</li> </ul> <p>With these two last projects, the activities under BD4 and BD5 do not seem relevant.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Please address the various comments above on the added value of the project compared to existing and past initiatives on clean energy activities.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/>The previous comment has not been addressed. Please be more specific in</p> | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
|                 |   | <p>UNEP's responses, explaining how the GEF Sec comments are addressed and clarifying which parts of the PIF have been revised.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. Please expand on this section at CEO Endorsement.</p>   |   |
|                 | <p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul> | <p>We will address this point once the project will have been revised.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>Please address the other comments and review the financial sustainability and potential for scaling up of component 3.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/>The previous comment has not been addressed. As in the comment in box 12, please be more specific in UNEP's responses.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>This project provides an innovative strategy to build upon existing national plans for sustainability called Reimaanlok. The GEF project will help provide needed biodiversity and other information for these plans as well as support in operationalizing these strategies and guidelines for integrated natural resource management in 5 atolls. Based on the lessons learned in these areas, the program can be scaled-up to the other atolls of the RMI and beyond. This project will also focus on financial</p> | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, this project is helping to scale up the implementation of an innovative holistic natural resource planning and management strategy called Reimaanlok, which builds on the traditional management systems. By building community capacity and using traditional systems, the project builds in sustainability. The experience from these 5 pilots can be taken to other atolls and potentially other parts of the Pacific.</p> |



| Review Criteria   | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
|                   |   | sustainability mechanisms for natural resource management.   |   |
|                   | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?   |  | April 14, 2017<br>Yes, there are reasonable explanations for the changes made.                      |
|                   | 15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? |  | April 14, 2017<br>Yes, the cost-effectiveness of the project in this context has been demonstrated. |
| Project Financing | 16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?  | <p>No. To be revised. The result framework is too broad and there is a risk of dispersal of efforts. See comments above (cell 7).</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>No.</p> <p>a) There is almost no co-financing in Table A for the proposed climate change mitigation (CCM) activities of the project. Such situation usually indicates a low involvement of the partners in those activities and a reduced potential for sustained results, replication and scaling up. Please increase the co-financing for these activities in a significant way. Please also note that in most project the co-financing level for CCM activities is higher than for other focal areas.</p> <p>b) The co-financing presented in Table A and B for CCM activities is not consistent.</p> <p>c) Component 3 includes the implementation of a financial scheme for which one would expect a relatively</p> | April 14, 2017<br>Yes.  |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)                 |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
|                 |   | <p>important co-financing. This is not the case. Please clarify who would fund the proposed scheme, and include the needed cash co-financing in Table B and C.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/> a) Please clarify the reason why there is no co-financing for activities related to objective CCM-4. Such situation usually indicates a low involvement of the partners in those activities and a reduced potential for sustained results, replication and scaling up.<br/> b) Cleared.<br/> c) Please see Q7 i) and review the UNEP's response to the previous comment c) accordingly.<br/> d) Please review all financial tables to clear the errors automatically identified in PMIS.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. Additional co-financing would be welcome at CEO Endorsement.</p> |  |
|                 | <p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?<br/> <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p> | <p>In the incremental reasoning, please explain what is financed by the cofinancing, as part of the baseline scenario.</p> <p>The UNEP co-financing is \$100,000 only, and in-kind. Please increase this.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Feb 13, 2014:<br/> Please address Q16 and review Table C accordingly.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:</p>   | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Project co-financing has been confirmed.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  | <p>Please see Q7 i) and review the UNEP's response to the previous comment accordingly.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. We recognize the challenges in finding co-financing in the RMI and encourage UNDP to seek further co-financing opportunities during PPG.</p>  |  |
|                 | <p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>  | <p>- Management costs of \$372,000 are acceptable (please revise the formulation in the table B).</p> <p>- The component 6 cannot be added to management costs. Please, revise.</p> <p>FJ - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>The requested GEF financing for the project management cost is above the limit of 5% of the GEF grant (5.26%). Please reduce the project management cost.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 23, 2014:<br/>Cleared.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |
|                 | <p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?<br/><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency</p> | <p>A PPG of \$45,500 is proposed (for a GEF cost of \$49,595, including \$4,095 fees). This amount seems relatively low for such project in such complex conditions. If the project grant is not modified, \$75,000 is available. This amount might be adjusted with the project grant within the limits of the</p>   | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>                          |

| Review Criteria                   | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                   | report on the activities using the PPG fund?   | STAR allocations endorsed in the PFD.<br><br>FJ - Feb 13, 2014:<br>Cleared<br><br>SW - July 29, 2015<br><br>Yes. Given the expense and challenges of developing a project in the RMI, the PPG is justified. |  |
|                                   | 20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?            | NA  | NA   |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?    |   | April 10, 2017<br><br>No.<br><br>Please address the following:<br><br>Biodiversity -<br>Hectares (starting B28) - Please list the biomes of the hectare numbers.<br>International designation - Are any of these places KBAs?<br><br>June 8, 2017<br><br>Yes. As a point of clarification, it appears that none of these areas are KBAs. |
|                                   | 22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? |   | June 8, 2017<br><br>Yes.   |
| Agency Responses                  | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:  |   |  |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>  |   | April 14, 2017   |

| Review Criteria                    | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                    |   |  | Yes.   |
|                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul> |  | NA   |
|                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>            |  | April 14, 2017   |
|                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>     |  | Yes.<br>NA   |
| <b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>  |   |  |  |
| <b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b> | <b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>                     | <p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. It is requested to hold consultation session between UNEP and GEF SEC to discuss the project and find potential ways to streamline and improve the design.</p> <p>FJ - Feb 13, 2014:<br/>No. Please address the comments above. Please contact the GEF secretariat prior to resubmission.</p> <p>FJ - June 23, 2014:<br/>No. A large portion of the previous comments has not been addressed and the GEF secretariat has not been contacted prior to resubmission. The way the project is structured and presented needs to be revised significantly. Key elements to take into account for these revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please consider redesigning the PIF with a more concise presentation and results framework focused on the elements highlighted in the review sheet.</li> <li>2. The complementarity of the activities targeting different focal areas needs to be explained to avoid giving the impression that the project is only a juxtaposition of unrelated activities;</li> </ol> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>3. For climate change mitigation activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rationale for CCM funding needs to be based on mitigation-related issues, and not climate adaptation/resilience challenges;</li> <li>• The PIF needs to explain what has been achieved by past CCM initiatives (including ADMIRE), what lessons were learned from these and what barriers remain for the sectors targeted by CCM activities in the project;</li> <li>• The project needs then to explain how the proposed activities will overcome identified barriers;</li> <li>• CCM activities need to be designed to deliver GHG emission reductions/mitigation. This is not the case with the current project focus on policies, outreach and monitoring.</li> <li>• With the funding amount allocated to CCM activities, we strongly advise the project to focus on only one sector to ensure a significant impact.</li> <li>• The policy support activities need to clarify what policy/regulatory reform(s) the project intends to target;</li> <li>• The project is expected to include activities/mechanisms ensuring that CCM benefits can be sustained, replicated and scaled up beyond project completion. Capacity building would not be considered sufficient for that.</li> </ul> <p>We strongly advise the agency to contact the GEF secretariat prior to resubmission. In addition, for future responses, please respond to GEF Sec comments one by one rather than providing general</p> |  |

| Review Criteria                             | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  | <p>responses.</p> <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. This project is being recommended for approval. Since the change in agency, this project has gone through significant changes that help it to be focused and deliver global environmental benefits.</p> |   |
|   | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | <p>SW - July 29, 2015</p> <p>Please provide greater detail and information in the areas highlighted in the PIF review.</p>  |   |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? |   | <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>No. Thanks you for the good work so far. Please revise and resubmit.</p> <p>June 8, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the revisions, but a few issues remain under questions 7 and 8.</p> <p>September 12, 2017</p> <p>Yes, this project is being recommended for CEO Endorsement.</p> |
|   | First review*                                      | August 22, 2013   | April 14, 2017  |
| Review Date (s)                             | Additional review (as necessary)                   | February 13, 2014   | June 08, 2017   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)                   | June 23, 2014   | September 12, 2017  |
|   |  |   |   |

\* 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.