



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

|  |  |                              |                  |
|--|--|------------------------------|------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4583   |                              |                  |
| Country/Region:                            | Turkey   |                              |                  |
| Project Title:                             | Sustainable Land Management and Climate Friendly Agriculture |                              |                  |
| GEF Agency:                                | FAO  | 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): | LD-1; LD-1; CCM-1; CCM-5; BD-2; Project Mana; CCM-5;         |                              |                  |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0  | Project Grant:               | \$5,750,000      |
| Co-financing:                              | \$21,300,000   | Total Project Cost:          | \$27,050,000     |
| PIF Approval:                              |  | Council Approval/Expected:   | June 01, 2012    |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                  |
| Program Manager:                           | Ulrich Apel  | Agency Contact Person:       | Ekrem Yazici     |

| Review Criteria                | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?   | Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: for UNFCCC, yes.<br><br>08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes.  |  |
|                                | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?  | 08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes, with endorsement letter dated 10/03/2011.   |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?        | 08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes. FAO has appropriate technical expertise and field experience.                                     |  |
|                                | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?   | n/a  |  |
|                                | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?              | 08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes. Fits with FAO strategic objectives. FAO country office in Ankara has capacity to provide support. |  |
|                                | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all |  |  |

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Resource Availability |  |   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>                             | Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: Yes for Climate.<br><br>08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes for LD, BD.  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>                       | Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: Yes for Climate.<br><br>08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes for LD, BD.  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul> | n/a   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>    | n/a   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>                  |   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>                            | n/a   |  |
| Project Consistency   | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?      | Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: Yes for Climate.<br><br>08/08/2011 UA:<br>Yes for LD, BD.<br><br>03 Apr 2012 UA:<br>Remaining issue in Table A - according to PIF preparation guidelines, the Expected FA OUTCOMES need to be assigned Indicative Grant and Indicative Co-financing amounts (Not the outputs as in the PIF. And please break down co-financing by each FA Outcome as well).<br><br>10 Apr 2012:<br>Addressed.<br><br>Cleared |  |
|                       | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?            | 08/08/2011 UA:<br>LD-1, BD-2<br>Please clarify below issues concerning CCM focal area:  |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>a) In multi-focal area projects, when it is unclear as to what funding is being used for a particular sub-component, we sometimes ask for funding to be listed for the individual objectives within each project component in Table B. This project is one of those unclear cases. Please list (preferable within Table B) the amount of funding that is coming out of CCM-1 or CCM-5 for a component. Knowing this would help answer this question, as well as make the project framework clear.</p> <p>b) Climate-friendly agriculture is about designing agricultural systems that provide multiple benefits, including carbon sequestration, reduction of emissions, clean air and water, wildlife habitat, and, of course, crops for food, fiber or fuel. If the proposed activities are occurring within the same landscape-sized area, (there looks to be several areas one on degraded lands, another rangelands and pastures. Several areas are OK, it is just that targeting multiple benefits in each area is expected, not a windbreak here in this area and far away some other technique in isolation) then this may be innovative in this region, and CCM-1 funds could be appropriate. The CCM team is positive toward the project, but the text needs to be written to be clear about what activities being proposed to be done are at the CCM-1 stage of tech transfer and what activities are at the other stages. (see also point (d)).</p> <p>c) Sub-component 2.3, Demonstrations of the feasibility of agricultural methane (biogas) capture and conversion is usually funded by CCM-3. It appears that the intent is to fund it from CCM-1, and if so, please add a few sentences describing the situation in Turkey, which should indicate that indeed the technology</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>adopted. If the technologies are at the diffusion stage in the country, then the CCM-3 objective would be more appropriate. More on this in d), just below.</p> <p>d) From section B.1 on Climate Change:<br/>         "These technologies have been researched and tested, are viable and have significant potential in Turkey. However, they have not been widely adopted because a scheme to support large scale adoption and mainstreaming of these practices is missing." To try and make this explanation as simple as possible: These sentences indicate that the project is providing a scheme to support large scale adoption and mainstreaming of practices, which is a step beyond the priority technologies that are commercially available but not adopted into markets and should be demonstrated, etc, which is the objective of CCM-1. Adding a paragraph or two that specifically discusses what CCM-1 funds are used for then, is needed. These sentences quoted above are not unexpected for the use of other funds and other targeted objectives, but these sentences would not apply to CCM-1 activities. Secondly, it is not totally clear what scheme to support large scale adoption is being proposed here exactly besides helping governmental agencies support demonstration farms, distribute information, developing monitoring systems for BD and CC, and working on land use plans. These items may all be useful but when we think about schemes to support large scale adoption, we may think business models and plans, economic analyses or investment possibilities or all of the above. These items contribute to sustainability of project outcomes (see also comments to Q10). Also, it looks like this business model and economic analysis thinking may be applied towards that biogas conversion</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

2.3 would be objective CCM-3. If it is CCM-3, further activities should be included that promote the technology scale-up, such as the establishment of financial mechanisms for investment and specific regulatory support.

1 Dec 2011/LH&FJ:

Thank you for the information and clarifications to points a) through d) above.

Given this information, there are some specific issues to deal with in the Table B:

a) In Table B, component 2, should the X to Y methane capture demonstrations actually have numbers instead of the letters X to Y?

In Table B, component 1, there is another "X to Y", should that include numbers? Also, about how many hectares will integrate biodiversity conservation, and will the biodiversity monitoring system cover that same area?

b) In component 2, GHG emissions avoided from agricultural practices should be listed in the rows in the table with the activities which are producing the reduced emissions.

c) Regarding component 3, please better emphasize the expected multiple benefits. For instance, the name of the component could be "Strengthening enabling environment for multiple benefits from sustainable land management".

d) Most importantly there are consistency issues throughout the text and Table 2, particularly component 2 and the climate objectives being targeted, especially between CCM-1 and CCM-5. For example in Section B.1, page 10 there is

improved management practices have not been introduced; but just after Table 1, the listed innovative conservation agriculture activities are said to be tested and are viable; but in section B.2 first paragraph a set of pilot projects on conservation agriculture achieved such important results that those involved are already asking how to implement it (which sounds like diffusion not demonstration, after all there have already been 10,000 has of pilots); and then under the incremental reasoning for GEF objectives is i) which is rehabilitation of degraded lands, and ii) models for conservation agriculture but in i) innovative is not emphasized, and in ii) previous text seems to indicate models exist (on the 10,000 ha through TIGEM.) On the one hand this project appears to be targeted on multiple benefits within the same landscape (Konya Closed Basin), but on the other the digesters could go elsewhere, the land use plan incorporating biodiversity is in Karacadag, and it is not clear if the carbon inventory system (which should include measurements on the ground) is covering all the areas with activities.

To deal with the inconsistency issues, first, be clear what activities are diffusion and what are demonstration. Also, in the text in a paragraph or two, please explain the synergies (if any) that are being captured by management of the same landscape, and the multiple benefits that are being produced. Indicate if any negative tradeoffs have yet been identified and are being minimized. (see also #11)

e) Once the items in Table B are clear, please ensure Table A matches. Each outcome in Table A must be in its own row, although several outputs could be associated with a row. Each

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>figure. And each output in Table A must include the number of and should match the precise language for each focal area output as documented in GEF5-Template Reference Guide 9-14-10rev11-18-2010_0 at <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624">http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624</a></p> <p>3 Apr 2012 LH &amp; FJ: Thank you for the modifications. Items a-d) have been addressed. Item e) on Table A needs further work but this is now listed in question 24. So we consider this question addressed.</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>08/08/2011 UA:</p> <p>Yes. The project is consistent with NAP for UNCCD and the National Biodiversity Strategy. The project also contributes to the National Climate Change Strategy.</p>   |  |
|  | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?  | <p>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: The project risk matrix mentions lack of sustainability of new technologies as a low risk, and says this will be mitigated through capacity building and awareness campaign. When we think about schemes to support large scale adoption, we may think business models and plans, economic analyses or investment possibilities or all of the above. These items contribute to sustainability of project outcomes. There is mention in the PIF about increased profitability (see Table 1), and other economic benefits, and increased household incomes (see B.3). However, more directly highlighting these economic benefits from these activities, and how they contribute to the scheme to support large scale adoption AND continued sustainability of the project would be useful, including in the risk matrix.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH: Addressed.</p> |  |

|                |   |   |  |
|----------------|---|---|--|
|                |   | Cleared   |  |
| 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>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: A better description of the baseline is needed. Also, the footnote on the co-financing table (Table C) is confusing so modifying that would help with the baseline.</p> <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/>In line with above comment, please elaborate on the baseline project in section B1. Presently, the PIF only describes a general baseline situation, what is needed is a more concrete description of the relevant ongoing or planned activities for which funding already exists (baseline funding) and for which GEF incremental funding is sought.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH: The baseline description is inconsistent. Some text at the top of page 10 indicates that with all the baseline work by GoT that experiences gained from the projects has not yet been institutionalized and extended to the national level, and that is needed. Then just before Section B.3 project activities are listed as building on the Anatolia Watershed Rehabilitation project, where many of the activities proposed here are listed as having occurred already and been very successful. This makes the activities proposed here sound less innovative. Please clarify the baseline in the text.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/>Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|                | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach  |   |  |



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | approaches to achieve similar benefits?  |   |  |
|  | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | <p>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011 &amp; 08/08/2011 UA:<br/>The activities do seem to be based on incremental reasoning, but to answer for sure a better description of the baseline project is needed.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH: A better description is still needed (see comments under #11).</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/>Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|  | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?   | <p>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: In Table B, the funding should be subdivided by TA and INV. At this point, the components can be left as is, but please list out the amount of funding being spent on TA and what is being spent on INV by focal area objective. This information is important to us and will be used and recorded in our database.</p> <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/>- Please consider to reformulate the project objective to make it more concise. Suggestion: "To improve sustainability of agriculture and forest land management through the demonstration and adoption of low-carbon technologies with win-win benefits in land degradation, climate change, and biodiversity conservation"</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH &amp; UA: Thank you for your responses but this is still not fully clear. We have the following follow-up issues:</p> |  |

question #8 (a) - (e).

2) Please make sure that the species list that is provided on page 8 is up-to-date and flawless. Check e.g. *Lutra lutra* (bat species?).

3) To what extent does the project include forestry activities? The project objective mentions forest land management and forest productivity and reforestation is listed as an output. If forest activities are considerable, please include the FA objective LD-2 into the framework table with an estimation of the indicative financing.

4) It is unclear whether the project area has been pre-selected or not (Konya basin?) and whether all the project activities will take place there. While it is not mandatory that all the activities are implemented in one and the same project area, it would be important to strive for synergy between the different project components, in particular with regard to the CCM-1 activities.

5) The project will result in commercially available digestion technologies being available with a supportive industry developed, that is, the CCM-1 funds will focus on demonstration. Then future investment proposals could take up the expansion and diffusion phase. To make the most of this demonstration phase, the project proponent may want to consider an experimental evidence based approach for this demonstration so as to produce meaningful results to inform future investment phases (i.e. an approach that would help identify the most important barriers, key variables for success, all information that will be needed for designing a successful diffusion phase). For more information about this evidence based approach, see e.g. GEF/C.41/Inf. 18 at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/experimental-project-design-gef-designing-projects-create-evidence-and-catalyze-investments->

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>28 Mar 2012 FJ &amp; LH:<br/> Items 1-4 are addressed. The response to item 5 describes how the project will inform future investment phases (i.e. an approach that would help identify the most important barriers, key variables for success, all information that will be needed for designing a successful diffusion phase) for the digesters' part of the project. By CEO endorsement, please enlarge the focus of this kind of approach to all the activities related to climate friendly agriculture and SLM so as to inform future national scale developments based on the projects results.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>  |  |
|  | <p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011: Thank you for giving CO2 estimates in Table B. What is needed is a brief explanation of how many hectares are being multiplied by what CO2 density factor for each estimate (which could be placed in table b), with a few sentences describing the assumed baseline comparison in the text. Most importantly, in section b.1. is a sentence about how soil erosion displacing tons of soil per ha per year releases much of sequestered carbon. Although soil erosion can displace much soil carbon, overall it is not clear that all that carbon is being released to the atmosphere. A more complicated formula for carbon benefits may be needed for this situation. The actual development of such a more complicated formula can occur during project preparation and presented in the CEO endorsement, but a few sentences saying that this may be complicated is needed in the text now.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH: Thank you for the clarification. At CEO endorsement, clear documentation will be needed about the carbon</p> |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>including a discussion about how by the end of this project the carbon benefits attributed to this project will be measured or substantiated. Carbon benefits from reduced soil erosion should be considered if more information is available by then.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|  | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | <p>Aug 5 2011/LH &amp; 08/08/2011 UA:<br/>The description is clear enough at this stage. We look forward to seeing specifics about benefits and gender dimensions in the CEO endorsement, so this is an item to consider during the project preparation phase.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?   | <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/>Not fully. Many of the field activities appear to rely on local community involvement. Please elaborate on how a participatory agenda will pursued to support field implementation.</p> <p>The present section B5 contains several abbreviations, please explain TIGEM, TUGEM, TAGEM and other abbreviations throughout the text.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011 UA:<br/>Adequately addressed at PIF stage. More detailed and concrete information is expected at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)  | <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/>Yes, but please refer to comments to #10 on risks.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011 UA:<br/>Adequately addressed.</p>   |  |

|                   |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
|                   | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 08/08/2011 UA:<br>The PIF is very brief about this. Please elaborate further in section B6 by including other relevant initiatives.<br><br>1 Dec 2011 UA:<br>Adequately addressed.   |  |
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   | Aug 5 2011/LH: The PIF has identified project coordination as a high risk to preventing project objectives from being achieved. We agree, and look forward to seeing the additional information about the PMU structure at the CEO endorsement stage.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
|                   | 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?  | Aug 5 2011/LH & 08/08/2011 UA:<br>The current guidelines are that GEF project management costs shall not exceed 5 percent of the total GEF grant for those projects requesting \$2 million and above, when the implementing agency is not the executing agency. The PIF is currently requesting 8.6%, please adjust accordingly or provide detailed information to justify the project management costs.<br><br>1 Dec 2011 UA:<br>Has been revised down to 5%.<br><br>Cleared. |  |
|                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the                              | Aug 5 2011/LH: This is difficult to answer until the baseline and activities are more clearly described  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/>Regarding component 3: In view of the incremental cost reasoning principle, it would appear more appropriate if GEF-funding would not be the major funding source for the implementation of this component. Please consider to adjust the funding/co-financing ratio of component 3.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH: The activities still need to be more clearly described to answer this question. The main questions we have with regard to this have been listed under question #8.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/>Remaining issue in Table A - please refer to comments under #7 and insert amounts by FA OUTCOME (not output).</p> <p>10 Apr 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/>Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>                          |  |
|  | <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br/>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> | <p>Aug 5 2011/LH &amp; 08/08/2011 UA:<br/>The footnote on the co-financing table is confusing as to whether the indicative co-financing is new and additional; the situation needs to be better explained. Please explore options to increase the co-financing, in particular new and additional money. The general category of beneficiaries can be mentioned but should only be summed into the co-financing total if co-financing from beneficiaries can be confirmed at endorsement stage.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH &amp; UA: Our comments in the first review have not been fully addressed. We would like to kindly remind you to explore all options to increase the co-financing. Moreover, the general category of beneficiaries can be</p> |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p>co-financing total if co-financing from beneficiaries can be confirmed at endorsement stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, please address the automatically generated responses of PMIS on the co-financing figures below:</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - FA Strategy Framework (FASF) and Project Framework total cofinance amounts differ<br/> ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ<br/> ERROR in PIF - PIF FASF and Finance Overview total cofinance amounts differ<br/> ERROR in PIF - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/> Cofinancing has been increased to a ratio of 1 : 3.7</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | <p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> | <p>08/08/2011 UA:<br/> FAO contributes \$300,000 in cash and \$100,000 in kind. We understand that FAO is not a financing organisation, however, in view of FAO being involved in the implementation of the UN Development Cooperation Strategy for Turkey and its presence through the FAO office in Ankara, a higher contribution would be welcomed.</p> <p>1 Dec 2011/LH &amp; UA:<br/> Thank you for the additional recognition of the importance of the role of FAO in this project.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>  |  |

|                                   |  |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 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?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Convention Secretariat?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Council comments?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |   |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation        |  |   |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage       | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | <p>Climate/LH/Aug 5 2011 &amp; 08/08/2011 UA: Not recommended. Please address comments and revise PIF.</p> <p>Dec 1, 2011 LH &amp; UA (second review): Not recommended. Please address our follow-up clarification requests.</p> <p>Summary of issues to address (please refer to details under the respective questions):<br/> A. There are consistency issues throughout the text and Table 2, particularly component 2 and the climate objectives being targeted, especially between CCM-1 and CCM-5 (see under #8). Given this: please 1) Be clear what activities are diffusion and what are demonstration. Make sure this is consistent with existing/on-going activities, existing barriers/difficulties/impediment and that it is indeed incremental.<br/> 2) Please explain the synergies (if any) that are being captured by management of the same landscape, and the multiple benefits that are being captured by the management of the same landscape.</p> |  |



|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>minimized.</p> <p>3) Be clear what activities will include a carbon monitoring system.</p> <p>B) Regarding the CCM-1 component: To make the most of this demonstration phase, the project proponent may want to consider an experimental evidence based approach for this demonstration so as to produce meaningful results to inform future investment phases (see under #14).</p> <p>C) Please clarify the extent of forestry activities planned and whether this justifies the inclusion of an LD-2 objective.</p> <p>D) Please make sure to fully justify biodiversity funding by explaining the global biodiversity benefits and a correct and updated species lists.</p> <p>E) Please address data inconsistencies regarding co-financing and explore all ways to increase the indicative co-financing.</p> <p>3 Apr 2012 UA &amp; LH:<br/>No. Please address remaining issue in questions 7 and 24. Upon adequate revision, PMs will recommend the PIF for WP inclusion.</p> <p>11 Apr UA &amp; LH:<br/>Yes. We recommend the PIF for CEO clearance for WP inclusion.</p> |  |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |   |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |   |  |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |   |  |

|  |                                  |                   |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|
|  | Additional review (as necessary) | December 01, 2011 |  |
|  | Additional review (as necessary) | April 03, 2012    |  |
|  | Additional review (as necessary) | April 11, 2012    |  |
|  | Additional review (as necessary) |                   |  |

**\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. 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 | <b>3. Is PPG 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.