



# GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT\*

GEF Program ID:	4620		
Country/Region:	Regional (Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco)		
Program Title:	MENA-DELP Desert Ecosystems and Livelihoods Program		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; BD-2; CCM-3; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$24,270,000
Co-financing:	\$226,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$250,470,000
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Song Li

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>31 August, 2011</p> <p>This is a Programmatic Approach that includes four countries: Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, and Morocco, all of which are eligible for GEF funding.</p> <p>Algeria is also eligible for the SCCF from which it is seeking additional support under the program.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>None of the countries have yet submitted a formal letter of endorsement, although the Agency has informed us that all four OFPs have already committed to do so. Morocco has submitted a letter expressing its interest in the Program, pending completion of a "national decision process".</p> <p>Please provide Endorsement Letters for all countries to include specific amounts being committed from STAR allocations.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p>

		<p>Endorsement letters are still missing for Algeria and Morocco.</p> <p>28 September 2011</p> <p>Please submit endorsement letters as soon as possible.</p>
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank is well placed to lead this Program given its strong presence and track record with natural resources and climate change projects in the region.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank has a Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) and Country Partnership Strategy (CSPs) for each of the four countries, which clearly underpin the proposed Program. The Program will seek to leverage existing or planned country-specific development projects or initiatives as a means of increasing the role and importance of deserts.</p> <p>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"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes all the amounts requested by countries are consistent with their allocations under the STAR.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, the STAR allocation requested under each focal area is available. Jordan is a "flexible" country and will utilize most of its allocation (\$3.27 million) for its project under the Program. Other countries will utilize the STAR allocations as</p>

		<p>Algeria - LD (\$1.99 million) and BD (\$3.01 million)  Egypt - LD (\$1 million), BD (\$1 million), and CC (1\$ million)  Morocco - LD (\$4.5 million) and BD (4.5 million)</p> <p>For CCM, please note that there is an inconsistency between Table A and B: Table A identifies only CCM-1 as a FA objective (with \$1.7m) , while in Table B the components 2 and 3 include only CCM-3. This inconsistency is also repeated in the Para 1 on page 8.</p> <p>Please address these discrepancies.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>	<p>N/a</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes. The proposed grant is within the resources available from the SCCF program for climate change adaptation (SCCF-A).</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The Program is also requesting \$6 million from the focal area set-asides for a regional project on knowledge sharing and dissemination. Based on criteria for these set-aside funds under each focal area, the following should be noted:</p> <p>LD - \$2.5 million request is consistent with focal area support regional and thematic integration of SLM, but the amount requested is not adequately justified by the proposed SLM related activities;</p> <p>BD - \$2.5 million requested is consistent with focal area support for addressing supra-national strategic priorities or to incentivize countries to make substantive changes in state of biodiversity at the national level through participation in global, regional, or multi-country projects; the amount requested is, however, not adequately justified.</p> <p>CCM - \$1 million requested is not consistent focal area support for regional and</p>

allocation for a national project raises questions about the value-added of investing \$1 million of the focal area set-aside; otherwise CCM set-aside funds cannot be used for regional projects in PFDs;

Please take note of these and adjust the proposed project accordingly. Specific justification should be provided for each of the focal areas in Section H of the PFD, taking into account the potentially value-added relative to the focal area strategy and the country-driven priorities. This should take into account the following:

-for LD - clarification of specific SLM issues to be addressed that warrant regional integration, and how these will be achieved through the regional project;

-for BD -the potential for contributing to conservation of globally threatened species in the desert ecosystem, and consistency with the CBD COP9 guidance in this regard;

-for CCM - that contribution to the regional project would be better justified if (i) CCM was also considered in the formulation of the national projects, and (ii) the specific capacity needs at the regional level were identified based on the achievements and lessons learned by the existing initiatives; For example, the TA should enable decision-support for harnessing renewable energy sources in the desert ecosystem, including a clear understanding of potential risks and tradeoffs; Such an approach has major advantages for mobilizing the interest of non-GEF eligible countries, which will help leverage greater investment in the sector.

26 September 2011

The request for focal area set-aside resources is still not adequately justified in the regional project. As a result, GEF is only prepared to provide set-aside funding for activities related to regional level coordination and knowledge exchange on substantive issues among countries participating in the program. The proposed reduction to \$4.8 million is not acceptable. Please reduce the request to a maximum of \$1 million based on guidance from the GEF CEO, and from the focal area with the highest amount programmed by countries in the PFD.

28 September 2011

		<p>from the LDFA set-aside and objectives scaled back accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The Program is aligned with the focal area results framework for LD, BD, and CCM, and with the CCA results framework as stated in Table A and outlined in B1.1.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes for CBD and UNCCD, and the consistency is also demonstrated in relation to sub-regional action plans to which the countries are committed.</p> <p>For CCA, the PFD does not discuss the alignment of the program with National Communications or the countries' commitments under the UNFCCC, nor does it refer to other relevant strategies, policies or plans. Please address this.</p> <p>09/26/2011</p> <p>For CCA: STILL NOT CLEAR. The revised PFD maintains that the activities proposed under the SCCF project in Algeria would be aligned with priority actions outlined in the country's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, but the document should further substantiate this claim. Algeria's Second National Communication clearly identifies priority adaptation measures, particularly in the areas of water management and agriculture, and would therefore provide a strong justification for the relevance and the country-drivenness of the adaptation measures proposed under the program.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe to what extent the activities proposed under the SCCF project in Algeria correspond to the priority adaptation measures outlined in the country's Second National Communication.</p> <p>09/28/2011 -- CCA: YES. The revised PFD demonstrates that the activities proposed for SCCF financing in Algeria are aligned with the country's</p>

		National Communication.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, all capacity building activities are proposed as part of the proposed investment priorities in order to ensure relevance and application for long-term sustainability. A specific focus on "Centers of Excellence" will also strengthen capacity links between countries and at regional scale.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Program Design	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes. The Program is designed to focus specifically on the Desert Ecosystem, which is a biogeographically distinct region that cuts across national boundaries of more than 10 countries. In addition to country-driven priorities for harnessing and safeguarding the resources and services, the PFD provides adequate justification for an integrated approach at regional scale that will ensure sustainability of the ecosystem as a regional and global asset. The PFD draws on recent analytical work that highlights the need for understanding and increasing global awareness of deserts as valuable ecosystems, which is also consistent with the International Decade for Deserts and the Fight against Desertification proclaimed by the UN Secretary General in 2010. The baseline scenario of little or fragmented investment will be greatly transformed into a comprehensive framework for desert ecosystem conservation as a result of the Programmatic Approach, which in turn will strengthen the engagement of all countries in the MENA region.</p> <p>For BD, please provide additional information on biodiversity to clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Sand cat and the Goitered gazelle are not "globally threatened species according to IUCN as mentioned on p10. The Sand Cat (<i>Felis margarita</i>, please correct the name) is "near threatened" and the Gazelle is vulnerable, following IUCN classification.</li> <li>- The Azraq wetlands used to support hundred thousands of birds in the 60', but with the water overpumping, the illegal wells, and the few quantities of water that are available for the ecosystem, this statement is not verified anymore. The maximum might be 12,000 birds.</li> </ul> <p>For CCA - With respect to climate change adaptation financed under the SCCF in Algeria, however, the PFD does not describe the extent to which the baseline project fails to consider and to address the effects of climate change. including</p>

		<p>vulnerability of the baseline project, its beneficiaries and its targeted areas, to the effects of climate change in order for this component to be considered.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Details relating to species and ecosystems have been addressed.</p> <p>09/26/2011 -- CCA: YES. The revised PFD clarifies the nature of the baseline project in Algeria and demonstrates that the project, Support for the Integrated Management of Deserts in Algeria (AGID), does not adequately address (i) the effects of climate change, including variability, in the vulnerable southern desert areas; (ii) the knowledge gaps associated with climate change vulnerabilities and appropriate adaptation measures; (iii) the need to integrate different sectors for effective adaptation; and, most importantly, (iv) the need to strengthen the desert livelihoods of the most vulnerable groups – women, children and the elderly.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) <b>will not</b> materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Because of its country-driven nature and strong partnership framework for implementation, GEF funding will play a catalytic role in leveraging resources and at the same time aligning investments for greater transformational impact. The four participating countries are all investing in baseline activities and initiatives that will be leveraged by GEF. Additionally, it is envisaged that the program will attract other GEF-eligible countries to engage in national level actions, as well as leverage resources from wealthy countries in the region that also stand to benefit from the regional level integrated approach.</p> <p>For CCA - While the baseline projects described in the PFD suggest a strong commitment of the participating countries, although further information is required as to the nature of the co-financing associated with these projects. As to the activities to be undertaken by the World Bank, more information is needed on the nature of its commitment to country-specific projects in Egypt and Jordan. With regard to the SCCF component in Algeria, it appears that the baseline project is adequate with a strong commitment of the Algerian government as illustrated in the indicative amount of co-financing.</p> <p>09/26/2011 -- YES. The revised PFD clarifies that potential IBRD co-financing for country-specific activities in Egypt and Jordan will be specified pending dialogue with the respective countries, and will be confirmed at the time of CEO Endorsement.</p>

		Cleared
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes. The incremental / additional reasoning is based on the potential for alignment, integration and consolidation of GEBs at the regional level. GEF resources will enable countries to design country-driven interventions that are consistent with the overall need to secure the desert ecosystem as a regional and global asset. The GEBs are presented as generic options that will require more detailed proposed desert ecosystem assessment will ensure appropriate baselines and indicators for the GEBs, including methods and approaches for monitoring and measurement.</p> <p>For BD, most of the activities proposed under the Objective 2 fit well with the GEF5 strategy: especially those linked to establish policies and regulatory frameworks for production sectors, develop a framework to incentivize ecotourism, improve local community capacities (training, community action plans), and develop land use plans and policies that integrate biodiversity issues. However, the construction of ecotourism facilities and circuits has to be further explained in the incremental reasoning. The questions of pertinence and sustainability of such operations have to be reinforced in the project documents. It is mentioned that the Program will seek to integrate desert agrobiodiversity conservation into production systems and create additional income opportunities for local communities through the promotion and marketing of their products. Please clarify how this is reflected in the result framework beyond just incentive mechanism for ecotourism.</p> <p>For CCA - As the PFD fails to adequately describe the vulnerability of the intended beneficiaries, the targeted areas and the baseline project to the effects of climate change, the additional cost reasoning underlying the SCCF investment in Algeria cannot be adequately assessed. More information would be needed to this end. (See Section 11 above)</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>The BD concerns have been addressed in the revised PFD.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>09/26/2011 --</p>



		<p>For CCA: For Algeria, please clarify the additional cost reasoning underlying the proposed SCCF support for oasis agriculture and livelihood diversification and consider reallocating the funds under this component to activities that directly address the effects of climate change on the most vulnerable groups and livelihoods, consistently with the priority adaptation measures outlined in Algeria's Second National Communication.</p> <p>09/28/2011 -- CCA: YES. The proposed SCCF component has been revised with a strong focus on piloting climate-resilient agricultural management practices in the context of the Five Year Agricultural Plan 2010â€“2014. The indicative activities directly target the vulnerable communities and livelihoods of the southern districts of Adrar and Ghardaia.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, to further strengthen the additional cost reasoning, the project document should clearly describe how the proposed SCCF grant complements the activities financed under the LD and BD focal areas of the GEFTF.</p>
	<p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The Program Framework includes three main components that are consistent with the proposed objective. The first two components are focused on country-driven investment priorities, including a specific focus on renewable energy by one of the countries (Egypt). On the one hand, the relatively small level of investment of GEF resources in the latter (i.e. \$0.8 million) raises questions about the relevance of this specific component for the program. On the other hand, it also presents a strong case for the third component on technical assistance, which is designed to mobilize greater focus on the potential of the desert for renewable energy development based on planned or existing activities in the region. This needs to be further clarified in the framework based on targeted outcomes and outputs for Component 3.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>For CCM â€“ CCM-1 is still identified as the responding FA objective; however the PFD description doesn't support this choice. CCM1 activities should specifically include the technology transfer dimension (establishment of technology transfer mechanisms, technology cooperation, purchase of licenses, adaptation of exogenous technologies to local conditions, etc.), and avoid any support to technologies at the diffusion stage or the wide-scale dissemination of proven and available technologies.</p>

		<p>baseline. Specific CCM funding and activities for each project are not described. One phrase references to CCM activities are outbalanced by the analytical references to other focal area.</p> <p>Please address these in the PFD and Project Annexes.</p> <p>28 September 2011</p> <p>All CCM concerns have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, and there is a clear emphasis on participatory approaches to enable full engagement of beneficiaries.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, relevant stakeholders have been identified and their participation taking into consideration. The PFD also includes details of roles that will enable strong engagement of national and regional entities as a means of ensuring long-term sustainability of interventions.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, and it is noted that climate risks will be integrated into individual projects to ensure appropriate mitigation measures at national level. An important risk that was also considered as substantial is the potential for continued regional instability following the "Arab Spring". Proposed mitigation measures are based on the Agency's policies and practices in the countries, which will ensure that the proposed projects are not affected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The PFD does not provide adequate description of relevant initiatives to be coordinated with, especially those already funded by the GEF. Other than the FAO-led Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS), no</p>

		<p>MENARID Program from GEF-4 have not been highlighted. Please provide a more clear description of relevant initiatives for potential linkage and coordination.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Coordination with other initiatives is now reasonably reflected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>It is noted that the overall program will be implemented as a coherent whole, building largely on the regional project but linked to national level arrangements. This will ensure consistency in approaches across the countries in order to maximize potential for synergy. Appropriate institutions will be engaged at this level, including Centers of Excellence. At national level, execution arrangements will be determined during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
<p>Program Financing</p>	<p>20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>No. At nearly 8 per cent of the total GEF grant, the funding level for project management cost is too high. Please reduce to under 5 percent (meaning under \$1,348,500)</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Please adjust the amount accordingly based on final total GEF grant.</p> <p>28 September 2011</p> <p>The amount is now at \$1,213,500 representing 5% of the total GEF grant.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Yes, the amount per focal area objective is appropriate and consistent with the proposed investments for outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

		<p>For CCA: NOT CLEAR. The SCCF grant for Algeria has been raised from \$3M to \$4M without any change to the outputs in Table B. It is not clear why the grant amount has been changed and what additional adaptation measures are proposed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please justify the increase in the SCCF grant.</p> <p>09/28/2011 -- CCA: YES. The SCCF request in the revised PFD has been reduced to \$3M.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The proposed co-financing amount is in accordance with planned baseline investments in the participating countries, but based mainly on a major initiative in one of the countries. It is noted, however, that the amount is likely to increase considerably pending ongoing discussion between the Agency and a few of the countries. This makes the current ratio of almost 1:9 quite appropriate as a start for the program</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>The Agency co-financing is currently limited to the project in Morocco. As noted above in 22, the Agency has indicated that discussions are still underway with Governments of Egypt and Jordan, which will lead to baseline investments linked directly to the Program. Please indicate in the PFD that the Agency co-finance in these other countries will be confirmed at the time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>This has been addressed in the revised PFD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	
	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&F Plan that monitors	

	and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	<p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Please address comments and concerns raised by STAP.</p> <p>28 September 2011</p> <p>The Agency has noted that STAP comments will be taken on board during project preparation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	<b>27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?</b>	<p>31 August 2011</p> <p>Clearance is not yet recommended for the PFD. Please address and/or clarify the following issues highlighted in the Review:</p> <p>For GEFTF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Endorsement Letters from all OFPs</li> <li>- Discrepancy for CCM objectives between Table A and B, and in para 1, page 8</li> <li>- Request for focal Area set-aside funds (#6)</li> <li>- Imbalance in program components (#14)</li> <li>- baseline information for BD (#11)</li> <li>- desert agrobiodiversity and ecotourism links (#13)</li> <li>- Coordination with other related initiatives in the MENA region</li> <li>- Agency co-financing for Egypt and Jordan</li> <li>- Reduce management cost amount to at most 5% of total GEF grant</li> </ul> <p>For SCCF:</p> <p>Please refer to sections 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13. It seems unclear at this stage what, if any, advantage there would be in adding the Algeria SCCF component to this program.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p>

		<p>Clearance is still not recommended. Please address remaining issues in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- #6 (for set-aside funds and regional project),</li> <li>- #14 (for CCM objectives and proposed country investments),</li> <li>- #20 (management costs), and</li> <li>- #26 (STAP comments).</li> </ul> <p>09/26/2011 – For CCA - Please refer to sections 8, 13 and 21 on issues related to Algeria. Please clarify further in the PFD how the SCCF investment will be leveraged beyond and regionally through this Program.</p> <p>09/28/2011 -- CCA: YES. All remaining concerns have been addressed and the PFD is recommended for clearance.</p> <p>28 September 2011</p> <p>Yes, the PFD is now recommended for CEO clearance.</p>
	<p>28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>28 September 2011</p> <p>For GEFTF Investments (addressing LD, BD, CCM Agendas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear evidence of "incremental" value of GEF investments relative to baselines in each project</li> <li>• clear evidence of focal area specific outcomes and outputs based on national priorities and action plans, including for the relevant Conventions</li> <li>• adequate description of spatial targets (i.e. geographical coverage) with respect to the desert ecologies and land-uses to be targeted</li> <li>• adequate description of how spatially linked components will be mutually reinforcing to effectively manage tradeoffs, including a set of indicators to measure the global benefits to be generated in country projects</li> <li>• adequate description of beneficiaries (including gender-specific consideration) and approach to enhancing grassroots participation to deliver both environment and development benefits</li> <li>• clear description of CCM baseline projects and incremental CCM activities, including detailed information about renewable energy technologies adopted and estimates of carbon benefits</li> <li>• an explicit M&amp;E budget</li> </ul> <p>For SCCF –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By CEO Endorsement, to further strengthen the additional cost reasoning, the project document should clearly describe how the proposed SCCF grant</li> </ul>

		GEFTF.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 31, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 28, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

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

**REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL**

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.