



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

GEF ID:	4770		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Areas of High Value for Biodiversity in Continental Ecuador		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$70,320	Project Grant:	\$4,258,788
Co-financing:	\$19,407,147	Total Project Cost:	\$23,736,255
PIF Approval:	April 20, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Rikke Olivera

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?	12/12: Yes, the country is eligible to BD.	06/03: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12/12: Yes, Marcela Aguinaga Vallejo, the GEF OFP for Ecuador has endorsed the project in a letter dated November 25, 2011 requesting a total of \$3,441,667 from the GEF.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12/12: Yes, FAO is well in its role, assisting Ecuador in developing fisheries regulation and mangrove management. FAO has extensive experience in the sector of Ecuadorian fisheries and has developed and disseminated numerous guidelines and	06/03: Cleared.

*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)
		training activities regarding the code of conduct for responsible fisheries and good practices.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	12/12: N/A.	06/03: N/A.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>12/12: Yes, this project fits under the FAO national framework of Technical Assistance Priorities in Ecuador, and is fully consistent with the Rural Development and Forestry Environment Objectives. FAO has staff in-country and plans to provide project oversight through the Project Task Manager and Operation Officers. The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment, and by Conservation International Foundation. Please clarify if the FAO staff in Ecuador have technical capacity in Marine Conservation and protected area management.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed. A fisheries expert will support the implementation of the project.</p>	06/03: same as PIF stage. Cleared
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? 	12/12: Yes.	06/03: An additional US\$ 1,307,320 is requested from BD STAR Allocation. The Total project grant, US\$4,748,987, is within the resources available from STAR Allocation. Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	12/12: Yes, Ecuador has access to \$14,724 million in Biodiversity Focal Area.	06/03: An additional US\$ 1,307,320 is requested from BD STAR Allocation. The Total project grant, US\$4,748,987,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			is within the resources available from STAR Allocation. Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	12/12: N/A.	06/03: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	12/12: N/A.	06/03: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	12/12: N/A.	06/03: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	12/12: N/A.	06/03: N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12/12: The project is aligned with the biodiversity results framework. The expected outcomes of the project will focus on the outcomes 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2 of the GEF-5 strategy. Please, complete the column "Expected Outputs" of table A "Focal Area Strategy Framework". 04/04: Addressed.	06/03: Yes, the project is well aligned with the biodiversity result framework. Cleared.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12/12: Yes, the proposed project is fully in line with the GEF biodiversity objectives 1 and 2.	06/03: Yes, the proposed project is fully in line with the GEF biodiversity objectives 1 and 2. Cleared.
	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?	12/12: The link between this project and the country's NBSAP, the National System of Protected Areas is well described. The contribution of the project to the National Plan for Good Life 2009-2013 and the Strategy Policy of the National Protected Areas System for Ecuador 2007-2016 is also mentioned.	06/03: The project will support the implementation of the NBSAP and the Strategy Policy of the National Protected Areas System for Ecuador 2007-2016. Cleared.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12/12: Even if it is implied in the expected outcomes of the proposed project, more detailed information should be provided on how the capacities developed by the project will contribute to the sustainability of the	06/03: Yes, significant capacity building efforts will be done through the project implementation, especially targeting local communities and local governments. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outcomes. Specify who are the different stakeholders concerned.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>12/12: The baseline description provides useful information on the actions and investments planned by the government and international organizations in marine and coastal management. However, it could be useful to organize this information by project component and to provide details on the current investment for the marine and coastal management, especially on the activities with a local and/or national impact. Finally, the rationale to create four more protected areas should be provided (for example in showing the current weaknesses of the protected areas system in ecosystem representation).</p> <p>04/04: Addressed.</p>	<p>06/03: With regards to national priorities, the project scope has been expanded to mangroves and coastal ecosystems conservation. The baseline description provides useful information on the actions and investments planned by the government and international organizations in those areas. Cleared.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>06/03: Yes, the project will build on ongoing initiatives from the government (national and local), international NGOs, and local communities in order to develop an integrated coastal zone management. The spatial management will help to coordinate effort, improve conservation actions, and strengthen local ownership of the management process. The project will work both at local and national levels for the development of legal framework supporting initiatives on the ground. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>12/12: We understand that the project will contribute to the conservation of four marine turtle species, to the conservation of mangrove ecosystem, and will strengthen the global network of protected areas. However, more emphasis should be placed on the global benefits of protecting 15,000 hectares of coastal and marine habitats; of adopting sustainable management in 37,000 hectares of mangroves; of developing fishery administration systems for invertebrates, coastal demersal, and white fish; of creating four more protected areas. The composition of the marine ecosystem and/or the specificity of the area/species with regard to the global biodiversity could be a relevant entry point.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed at PIF stage. However, at the CEO endorsement, this chapter will have to focus only on the incremental activities requested for GEF financing. Furthermore, the recruitment of management team cannot be supported by GEF funding.</p>	<p>06/03: Yes, the project builds on ongoing initiatives from the government (national and local), international NGOs, and local communities to sustainably manage the coastal area. The project will notably focus its support to the establishment of MPAs targeting mangroves, nest areas of endangered marine turtles e.g. Green turtle, Hawksbill turtle, and coastal crocodile (critically endangered and included in the red list of reptiles of Ecuador). Cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>12/12: The framework is well developed and provides clear expected outputs, with both qualitative and quantitative elements. However, other outcomes have to be developed. Please include biodiversity status as part of the outcomes in part 1 (rate of mangrove coverage, status of marine species, coverage and integrity of habitats). The outcome 1.2 has to be more specific, in</p>	<p>06/03: Yes, the project framework is clear and well developed. Targets and SMART indicators have been developed. The suggested expansion of the scope to mangrove conservation is relevant and add value to the project's suitability. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>detailing the measures for biodiversity conservation. The outcome 1.3 should for example assess the number of boarding. Will the expected output 1.2.3 be clarified at the PPG stage?</p> <p>For the outcomes in part 2, the biodiversity status has to be part of the outcomes. The outcomes should assess the status of concerned fish stocks and their related species/ habitats. Another outcome should assess the biological and socio-economic status in the mangrove concessions.</p> <p>The expected output 4.1.2 would be paid for by the fees, so, please remove and adjust that budget accordingly.</p> <p>Finally, in the text, more detailed information on the implementation of the Fishery Management System has to be provided.</p> <p>04/04: As mentioned, the expected output 4.1.2 would be paid for by fees, so please remove the activity and confirm the budget adjustment. It is noted that futher information will be provided at the CEO endorsement, notably regarding output 1.2.3 and outcome 1.3.</p> <p>04/17: Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12/12: The PIF should detail how the fishery management system will be developed and will reduce the threats to biodiversity and ecosystem and generate global biodiversity benefits. The PIF should provide the rationale for focusing the fishery management system on only a few species.</p> <p>Furthermore, more information is requested on how the fishery management system and the mangrove concessions will fit under the management plan of each protected area and in the protected areas network. Please also clarify how the incorporation of the "economic valuation of the biodiversity" is integrated into these aspects of the project.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed at PIF stage.</p>	<p>06/03: The applied methodology is appropriate. The project will support a set of tools (TURFs, MPAs, concession, and incentive mechanism) to respond to the different local context and needs. To coordinate the different approaches, partners, the project will develop a Integrated Coastal Management Plan. Cleared.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>12/12: a) Concerning the development of the fishery management system further information should be provided, specifying the number of fishermen concerned, the socio-economic benefits of this project for them. The gender issue should be better addressed, especially because women are key actors in part of these fisheries. Concerning the mangrove concessions, more accurate information is expected as the experience started years ago.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed. However, at the CEO endorsement, please develop indicator</p>	<p>06/03: Yes, the project will directly benefit 1,300 concessionaries including 384 women whose income is essential to sustain their families. In addition, about 420 fishermen will directly benefit of the management measures developed by the project. The project will use territorial management instruments such as mangrove concessions or TURFs to counteract the pressures of the free access to natural resources. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		to monitor the women participation into the project activities.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	12/12: Further details and examples should be provided about the local stakeholders (footnote 37). Regarding the fisheries associations, please, better explain their role and their involvement in the governance process. Futhermore, instead of involving Tuna associations, the project should involve local and artisanal fishermen's associations. 04/04: Addressed.	06/03: The design of the project is based on participatory processes with local stakeholders and the development of capacities of groups using coastal and mangrove ecosystems. The design of the project recognizes the cultural differences that exists between groups and will adjust its activity in consequence. Finally, the project will identify and recognize the good practices that have been developed by concessionaires and will use them as foundation for the capacity building processes. Cleared.
	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)	12/12: Yes, information on the potential risks and on the appropriate mitigation measures has been included.	06/03: Cleared.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12/13: Yes, information is provided on the coordination with related initiatives at the regional and national level and the added-value of the proposed project. However, regarding the similar objectives with the projects: GEF project 3548 "Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation", and the EPS project on the consolidation of a regional network of marine protected areas; please, better clarify the distinction between the proposed	06/03: The project is consistent and properly coordinated with other initiatives related to coastal and marine management including with on-going GEF projects. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project and these two others projects. Furthermore, clarify the co-financing link with the EPS project.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>12/13: Please clarify how the Ministry of the Environment and Conservation International Foundation will jointly implement of the project.</p> <p>04/04: Information regarding the implementation arrangement is adequate. However, please clarify the status of Conservation International Foundation in Ecuador.</p> <p>04/17: Clarification has been provided. However, with regards to the key role played by CI and its current status in the country, by the time of CEO endorsement stage, a contingency plan should be developed, in case of CI has to withdraw. This contingency would ensure that there would be no drop in co-finance and that the implementation would not be impacted in a negative way.</p>	<p>06/03: Yes, the project execution arrangement is adequate. The Ministry of Environment will be the lead executing agency, with CI-Ecuador and the Humanist Institute for Cooperation (HIVOS) as executive partners. The mangrove concessionaire organizations, the municipal governments, and the Inter-Institutional Sea Committee will be the main beneficiaries of the project. Finally, cooperation will be developed with international cooperation agencies e.g. GIZ, national agencies e.g. FAN, and international NGOs e.g. WildAid. Cleared.</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>06/03: The project strategy and overall design structure is close to what was presented at PIF. However, there is an expansion in the scope of the project, integrating in particular mangrove and ecosystem conservation. This expansion of scope reinforces the purpose of the project by adopting a more integrated approach and strengthen the coordination efforts. The decision to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			expand the project scope to mangrove conservation was decided during PPG after analyzing the different alternatives. However, with the significant increase of the grant proposal (more than 5% of the total grant), the proposal will have to be submitted to council members before CEO endorsement. Cleared.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		06/03: N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12/13: Please, make sure that the project management cost is no more than 5%. 04/04: Addressed. The project management cost is 4.9%.	06/03: The project management cost has significantly increase since PIF stage from 4.9% to 6.8%. Please make sure that the project management cost is no more than 5%. 06/11: PMC is 4,9%. Cleared.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12/13: The proposed budget seems excessive considering the activities proposed and the outputs and outcomes to be delivered. Please either reduce it or provide sufficient rationale. 04/04: The issue has been addressed. Table A, there is a discrepancy between the sum of the co-financing components (US\$ 8,585,954) and the total shown (US\$ 8,610.954). Therefore please, update accordingly. Table C, the source of co-financing has to be either NGO or bilateral agency, therefore, please correct the third line of the table. 04/17: Addressed	06/03: The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. Cleared.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	12/13: The amount of grant and the	06/03: The co-financing ratio is 1:4.5.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>amount of in-kind have to appear in two different rows in table C. The co-financing amount of \$5.9 million is inadequate, please improve it. A large part of the activities will have a strong impact at the local and national levels and the global benefit will be minimum, thus please balance the budget between GEF and other co-financiers accordingly.</p> <p>04/04: The co-financing amount has been increased from US\$5,960,954 to 8,610,954. However, with regards to the comment made in the previous review, the ratio is still inadequate (1:2.8). Therefore, the project should seek new co-financing.</p> <p>04/17: Addressed. The co-financing amount has been increased from US\$8,610,954 to US\$12,396,654. The co-financing ratio is now 1:4,05.</p>	<p>Most of the co-financing letters are in Spanish. Please provide the translation and make sure there is a clear distinction between in-kind and cash financing.</p> <p>06/11: Translation has been provided. Cleared.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>12/13: The FAO will provide a grant to the project for an amount of \$150,000. This co-financing will represent less than 2.5% of the co-financing. The FAO should try to increase its level of co-financing.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed. FAO will provide an additional US\$ 100,000, in-kind.</p> <p>04/17: FAO will bring US\$100,000 in-kind, and US\$150,000 in grant.</p>	<p>06/03: The FAO contribution has been reduced from \$250,000 to \$75,540. Please provide the rational for such reduction.</p> <p>06/11: The FAO co-financing will be \$75,540 in cash and \$175,000 in-kind. Cleared.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with</p>		<p>06/03: The TT have been included with information for BD1 and BD2. The</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		project is not implementing activities related to the Cartagena Protocol, therefore no need to complete the TT for Objective 3. The TT have to be submitted in English, thanks to send the English version. 06/11: The TT has been submitted in English. Cleared.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		06/03: Yes, the proposal include a budgeted M&E plan. Cleared.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	12/12 Respond as appropriate.	06/11: Cleared
	• Convention Secretariat?	12/12 Respond as appropriate.	
	• Council comments?		06/11: Yes, the project had adequately responded to the Council comments. Cleared.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	12/12 Respond as appropriate.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12/13: No, please, address the comments raised above. 04/04: Until the cofinancing is increased, the project will not be recommended for CEO approval. Second, please address the remaining issues raised in the review sheet.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		04/17: The remaining issues have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance with the request that a contingency plan be developed by the time of CEO endorsement if CI has withdraw from the project as noted in question 20 above.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	04/04+04/17: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contingency plan on implementation arrangement - Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined - Co-financing is increased and confirmed - Details on investments using the GEF funding are provided - Implementation arrangements with partners and local authorities are well set-up - GEF TT are included - Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value is presented 	
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?		06/03: Cleared.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		06/03: The proposal cannot be recommended for CEO endorsement. Please address issues in items 23, 25, 26, and 27. Due to the major amendment in the budget request, the project proposal will have to be submitted to council approval prior

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			CEO endorsement. 06/11: The project is technically cleared. Due to the major amendment in the budget request, the project proposal will have to be submitted to council approval prior CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	June 03, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	June 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	01/23/2013: The proposed activities for the project preparation are appropriate. The PPG will notably finance : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a multi stakeholder consultation, - an analysis of the legal, regulatory framework, and capacities for MPA, mangrove concessions, and fisheries plan, - preliminary analysis and mapping of the coastline marine biodiversity baseline and identification of the major root causes of threats to biodiversity; and other socio-economic data, - an analysis of the execution modalities, - the development of preliminary financial sustainability strategy for mangrove concessions. 02/07/2013: The proposed activities are appropriate. We understand that CI will not implement anymore the PPG activities. Please clarify what will be the new arrangement modalities.

		03/04/2013: Addressed. Cleared.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>01/23/2013: The PPG budget is about US\$70,000. The suggested itemized budget is justified.</p> <p>02/07/2013: The GEF grant amount for the PPG has slightly increased (from US\$70,000 to US\$70,320). The co-financing has been significantly reduced (from US\$200,540 to US\$ 87,220). As mentioned above, the proposed activities for the project preparation are appropriate. However, regarding the significant decrease of co-financing, how will it be possible to correctly address all these activities. Regarding the new itemized budget, please provide the rationale of having reduced the GEF budget of all the activities related to data collection, analyses and having increased the budget for the project design.</p> <p>03/04/13: Addressed, but Table B there is a discrepancy between the total amount of the PPG and the sum of the items' budgets, please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>03/07/2013: Cleared.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>01/23/2013: Please, remind that since Jan. 1, 2013, a new fee policy is applied. For this PPG related to a project under \$10 million, please use the 9.5% option. Upon receipt of a revised PPG, the request will be recommended to the CEO for approval.</p> <p>02/07/2013: The PPG cannot be recommended at this stage. Significant changes have been made in the budget proposal and implementation arrangements which require further explanations as described in item 1 and 2.</p> <p>03/04/2013: The PPG will be recommended for approval, once the discrepancy between the figures in the Table has been resolved.</p> <p>03/07/2013: The PM recommends the PPG approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 23, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2013

* 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.