



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5208		
Country/Region:	Palau		
Project Title:	R2R: Advancing Sustainable Resources Management to Improve Livelihoods and Protect Biodiversity in Palau		
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; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,747,706
Co-financing:	\$15,729,915	Total Project Cost:	\$19,477,621
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Greg Sherley

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?	December 03, 2012 Yes: CBD party from 1999; CCD ratified 1999; FCCC ratified 1999.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 03, 2012 Yes a letter from Sebastian Marino dated September 20, 2012 is available. However although the total funding noted in the letter is greater than the total in Table D inclusion of the PPG noted in the letter would exceed the total in the letter. Also the Grant Amount is in excess of what is provided for in the letter. Please revise.	

*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>April 09, 2013: Please note that the LOE sent in the package is still the one from September 20, 2012. Please, provide the one recently produced.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Revised LOE dated 08/02/2013 provided. Cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	December 03, 2012 UNEP have presence in the region and experience in the field of REDD+ and SFM.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	December 03, 2012 There is no NGI.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>December 03, 2012 Please provide some detail on UNEPs' in-country capacity to implement the project.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 UNEP does not have staff in Palau. However, UNEP is part of the "Joint UN Office" in Palau and is already working in this country for another GEF project (PAS). Cleared.</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>December 03, 2012 Palau is a flexible country and therefore at liberty to reallocate between FAs. As at 11/23/12 remaining STAR allocation stood at: BD \$1.92; CC \$2; LD \$0.50. The proposed project funding total is within the remaining amount.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 09, 2013 There is budget discrepancy between Table B and Table D. the figures into table A, B, and C needs to be fixed regarding the Ridge to Reef program. The total amount requested for PPG has to be included in Table E only. As already mentioned, Palau is a flexible country and therefore at liberty to reallocate between FAs. If Palau uses this option, it has to be mentioned into the LoE. As at 04/09/13 remaining STAR allocation stood at: BD \$1.47; CC \$1.55; LD \$0.20. In revising the budget, please make sure that the proposed project funding total fits within the remaining amount.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Figures revised in line with rules on flexibility, details included in LOE. Cleared. Agency Fee should be no more than 9%. Please revise. Total request is greater than identified within the programmatic approach.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 Please re-check the figures in the Tables as there appears to be a number of errors. a) Agency Fee is at 9.6% and should be no more than 9%. Agency fee in Part 1 and Table D must match at the moment two figures are given \$399,475 and \$362,700.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) Table B Indicative Grant Amount sub total is given as \$3,752,270 but the total of the three components is \$3,722,300</p> <p>c) Table A and D figures for the Grant amount and Indicative Grant amount (a) should match</p> <p>d) Table D a separate line for BD (PPG) seems to contradict the PPG being funded from BD, SFM and LD in the footnote to the table.</p> <p>e) Table D please deal with the IW contribution similar to other countries in the Program where \$175,000 includes Agency fee.</p> <p>January 06, 2014 Part 1 of the PIF still contains two different Agency Fee figures - \$399,475 on Page 1 and \$378,450 in Table D. Agency fee should be no more than 9%. It is not possible to have two numerical values in the Tables - please ensure only one value per cell. Use of the latest version of the PIF template may be helpful. It is available at http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates</p> <p>January 23, 2014 Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>December 03, 2012 The request for SFM/REDD incentive funds is within the 3:1 ratio however there needs to be some additional justification for the entire amount as it is not clear how much of the project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>focuses on non-forest habitat.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 Some information has been provided. We understand that the project will develop activities on marine and terrestrial areas; in and out PA. The project will focus on at least 8,000ha of native forest. However, more information on the new PA and the activities developed with the additional funding from Ridge to Reef need to be provided.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Additional detail on forest activities provided. Cleared.</p> <p>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 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. 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		November 26, 2013 Additional text included in project framework and in description of project components. Cleared.	
	• 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?	December 03, 2012 In A1.1 please reconfigure this to reflect the GEF FA Strategies. BD-5 supports the NBSAP revision therefore it does not seem to be relevant to the project and is not included in the PF or in the text. Please remove. April 09, 2013 BD-5 has been removed. Cleared.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	December 03, 2012 The number of FA outcomes and outputs identified appears to be too many and is confusing what the project is proposing to do e.g. Output 2.2.1 does not appear to be reflected in the project framework. Please consider reducing and refocusing the project on a smaller number. The expected output 1.2.1 does not seem to match with the outcome 1.2, which focus on the increase of revenue for the PA system. Please ensure that in Table A the text used matches that provided in the FA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Strategies and that where parentheses are provided these are substituted with a numerical value. It is not possible to have the same outcome and output as in 2.3.</p> <p>Please include indicator metrics (examples of which are also given in the FA Strategies) e.g. based on METT, which score is expected for the PA or PA system concerned by the project?</p> <p>April 09, 2013</p> <p>The issue has not been fully addressed. The number of FA outcomes and outputs identified are still too many. The project aims to address SLM/SFM at community level, PA management and financing, Invasive species, Institutional and legal framework for SFM, capacity building, PES, certification...The project should focus on the key priorities and define measurable outputs.</p> <p>There is some incoherency between Table A, B, and the text. For example, Activities 1.1.2, 2.1, 1.2.2 in Table A are not further developed in Table B or in the text.</p> <p>It is well noted that the METT information for each PA and for the PA network will be provided at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Well noted that biological monitoring will be developed during the project, however some metric indicators and quantifiable outputs have to be provided in order to evaluate the added-value of the project.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>August 20, 2013</p> <p>The project continues to contain a very wide range of activities. Although no longer included in Tables A and B the text retains scope for PA development, PA financing, IAS/biosecurity policy development, IAS management, forest carbon accounting system, PES and certification. This appears over-ambitious given the resources available. It is suggested again that the project narrows its scope of activities to address only priority issues once these are clearly identified.</p> <p>Quantifiable outputs are still absent e.g. Component 2 what is expected in relation to IAS mitigation?</p> <p>November 26, 2013</p> <p>The project focus has been narrowed into three components addressing i) improving Palau's PAN, ii) implementing Palau's SLM policy and iii) coordination and capacity building across land use sectors.</p> <p>Cleared.</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>December 03, 2012</p> <p>The list of initiatives in A.2 is appreciated but does not provide insight to consistency with the project. Please expand.</p> <p>Also, in line with CoP guidance please explain how the project addresses the Aichi Targets (the five Goals are mentioned in A.1 but without any detail).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 09, 2013 The issue has not been addressed. Furthermore, please provide the rational and be more explicit regarding the support to the reporting to convention.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Additional details provided. Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>December 03, 2012 Capacity building is key activity in Component 3, but it is not entirely clear how the support network would operate or how the guidelines would be supported. Also there is no indication of within which groups capacity will be developed. Please also describe how this contributes to sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The issue has not been addressed. We understand that activities will be developed regarding the PA management, the SLM/SFM implementation. However, please provide more information regarding the capacity developed, the people targeted, and how this will contribute to sustain the project outcomes.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Target groups for capacity building have been included. Please ensure by CEO Endorsement STAP comments on links between planning and implementation, and project sustainability are addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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>December 03, 2012 The baseline is not clear. Pages 6-10 contain a lot of text but please reduce and focus this on project related information. The key drivers of habitat loss and damage are not clear e.g. how what is the scale or importance of loss through infrastructure, IAS, fire, overharvesting? It is not clear which of these are key particularly when studies are noted as ongoing and therefore should be addressed as a priority. Also the actions on Page 9 need to be clarified in terms of links as baseline initiatives e.g. #2 the NNR is just a statement of existence. What and how will the project build upon this? Finally, more information about the PAN, its governance, on-going activities and challenges will help to understand the added-value of the activities suggested in component 2 and 3.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The lenght of the text has been reduced. Some information related to the key drivers and the importance of loss have been provided. However, a more robust paragraph will have to be developed at the CEO endorsement phase. Regarding the list of conservation actions that the project will support (p9), please, clarify what will be the project's added-value to these on-going conservation actions. General information has been provided regarding the PAN. However, please be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>more specific about its governance, status of implementation. This will help to understand the added-value of the project. Finally, please quantify the baseline investment.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 The baseline description has been sharpened but details of levels of investment are still absent.</p> <p>The request for clearer details of the problems being addressed remains. Four issues are identified but no details of scale or magnitude are given. For example how much habitat is lost to agricultural development; what area of mangrove is lost to charcoal production? Climate Change is identified as a key threat but does not seem to be addressed in the proposal; fire is presented as a particular concern but is not reflected in the proposal. The connection between issue and response is therefore not clear and is further clouded by the range of activities proposed.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 The PIF has been largely re-written and now includes sufficient details of ecological threats and problems and management gaps that the project seeks to address. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>December 03, 2012 Incremental reasoning is difficult to assess at the moment given the baseline and component descriptions. Please revise.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The incremental reasoning is still poor. We understand that the project wants to ensure a better coordination between the two initiatives -PAN and SLM. This goal does not appear clearly in the suggested list of activities. Furthermore, due to limited success of the previous initiatives, how UNEP will make the difference. The added-value of the project with regards to the baseline is still unclear, as mentioned in the above item.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Incremental reasoning for the creation of PAs and SLM action plans have been improved. Component 3 is not clear however this is largely due to issues and baselines not being clearly stated.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 Incremental reasoning is much improved through the provision of a detailed baseline and description of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project components. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>December 03, 2012</p> <p>The consistency with a ridge-to-reef approach is not clear within the proposal. Although there are marine and terrestrial PAs the project as described does not appear to operate from ridge-to-reef. The summary suggests there is much more of a PA-related focus. Please explain further.</p> <p>The PF is not entirely clear. There is some discrepancy between Tables A and B e.g. FA 2.2.1 does not appear in the PF, PF 2.1.1 discusses new PAs but this is not mentioned in the Table A please clarify. FA 1.2 is about increasing the PA system revenue but Table B 2.5 mentions that PA will contribute to local economy.</p> <p>Component 2: is the SFM pilot to be developed inside the PAs ?</p> <p>There also seems to be some disconnect between the threats and drivers described in P6-10 and the activities in the PF. If drivers such as habitat destruction and overharvesting are key there needs to be much more focus on field level activities which will affect change in the communities (mentioned in B1) as using natural resources for daily needs.</p> <p>The project appears to be very policy and institutionally focused with Component 1 utilizing more than 1/3 of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the total grant and other non-field elements in Components 2 and 3. We would like to see clearer details of what and how the project will effect change on the ground.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 There is some inconsistency between Table A, B, and the text; as mentioned in item 8. Activity 1.1.2 of Table A is not included in Table B. Activities 1.2.1, 2.2.3, and 2.4.1 of Table B are not further mentioned in the text. Detailed information needs to be provided on PA activities (at least number of ha). Regarding the Micronesian Challenge Endowment trust Fund, we understand that the project will ensure the "transition" by supporting PAN activities. Because TF is usually used to cover the reccurent cost of well established PA, how the 4 news PA created by the project will be funded? Is there already an agreement with the TF?</p> <p>August 20, 2013 The Components have been largely re-written from the earlier draft. Please check wording as some outputs are more like outcomes and vice-versa. As commented earlier it is suggested that the number of sub-components is reduced in line with resources available. Component 1: GEF supports the capitalization of the Micronesia Challenge Trust Fund,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>through a project implemented by UNEP. Palau is one of the four countries involved. Please explain the rationale for this additional contribution, specify the status of the Palau Trust Fund, and its institutional arrangement.</p> <p>Component 2: Please explain what is proposed in 2.6</p> <p>Component 3: This appears to be a very mixed group of potential activities all of which could require considerable resources, please reduce the number of activities as discussed previously.</p> <p>Are the 8,000ha of forest under SFM in addition to or the same as identified in 1.1.5? What activities are planned? Please explain what an "innovative national mechanism for SFM" is.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 The project framework and supporting text has been largely re-written and provides a much narrower focus of activities and more integrated actions within the components. Cleared.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>December 03, 2012 No this needs some additional information throughout. As an example, 2.1.1 states one third of PAN sites to be effectively managed provides some information but what will be the metric for 'effectively managed', the METT? If yes, what is the current score and the expected one? Also it is unclear if four new PAs are to be created or if they are already existing and will just be added</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to the PAN. Therefore information on the rational, extent and focus of these is necessary. Please provide the calculations used to estimate the carbon benefits.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The METT score has to be provided for each concerned PA at CEO endorsement stage. Calculations for carbon benefits have been provided.</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>December 03, 2012 Socio-economic benefits are mentioned in B.3 but at a very generic level, please provide some specifics that will arise from this project including gender dimensions, and how these will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The issue has not been fully addressed. Please, provide some specifics that will arise from this project, and how these will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project. Preliminary figures on the revenue generated for communities, or the number of people involved in the SLM activities could be useful.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Additional details provided. Sufficient for PIF stage. By CEO Endorsement clearer description is expected.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	December 03, 2012 A range of organization is listed in B.5. At CEO Endorsement details of how this large list will be incorporated into project implementation will be expected.	
	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)	December 03, 2012 Please consider risks associated with project execution with community and local groups at the field level and those associated with climate resilience. April 09, 2013 cleared.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	December 03, 2012 Details of initiatives are provided but by CEO Endorsement further description of how the project will coordinate with these will be expected.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	December 03, 2012 Please provide some detail on project execution. April 09, 2013 A table listing the major stakeholders with their respective role has been included, however the table does not inform on how these stakeholders will operate together. Please, provide more information on the execution arrangement. August 20, 2013 Sufficient details for PIF stage. Additional details on execution arrangements expected at CEO Endorsement.	

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?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>December 03, 2012 PMC is slightly over 5%. Please reduce this to within 5%. This should be calculated based on the Sub-Total in Table A rather than the Total Project Cost.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 Figures have to be reviewed.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 PMC is below 5%. Cleared</p> <p>November 2013 PMC has increased to \$362,700 or 9.7%, please reduce to a maximum of 5%.</p> <p>January 06, 2014 PMC in Table B can only have one numerical value, solely for project management activities and should be no more than 5%.</p> <p>January 23, 2014 Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	<p>December 03, 2012 Funding appears appropriate, however this will be revisited given additional</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and outputs?	<p>details in incremental reasoning.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 This will be revisited given the potential changes in PF.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Please check co-finance figures in Tables A, B and C. Check for error in Table B, inclusion of PMC co-finance in Table A.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 Please re-visit the cofinance figures. Table A cofinance total is \$15,529,915. Table B Components sum to \$15,529,915 but is given as \$15,329,915 in the sub-total; and then subsequently incorrectly totaled.</p> <p>January 06, 2014 Review with updated figures in new template.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>December 03, 2012 Cofinance stands at \$15,529,951 which gives a ratio of 1:4.98. Of this \$5,400,000 (35%) is provided as grant. Further information on the co-financing, in grant, from the PAN will be appreciated.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>December 03, 2012 UNEP is providing \$200,000 in-kind cofinance. Please explore the potential to increase this.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	August 20, 2013 Please ensure relevant comments provided on the Program are addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>December 03, 2012 Not at this stage please address the issues above.</p> <p>April 09, 2013 The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please, address the issues raised above.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Not at this stage. Please see issues outstanding in particular the need to streamline activities proposed.</p> <p>November 26, 2013 The PIF is much improved but there are a number of problems with finances which require addressing.</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		January 23, 2014 This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in a subsequent work program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
Review Date (s)	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	December 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 26, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 06, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2014	

*** 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.

