



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

GEF ID:	5765		
Country/Region:	Regional (Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico)		
Project Title:	Integrated Transboundary Ridges-to-Reef Management of the Mesoamerican Reef		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$155,963	Project Grant:	\$9,018,349
Co-financing:	\$51,277,908	Total Project Cost:	\$60,608,183
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Hume

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala and Belize are eligible.	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, Focal Point endorsement letters have been provided for all 4 countries.	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, funding is available through IW.	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?  <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>March 24, 2014 (IW): Yes, the project is aligned with the IW Focal Area Strategy Framework and addresses all 3 objectives. While focused on addressing threats to the marine environment, watershed ecosystems are addressed as well in line with the "Ridge to Reef" concept supported by IW.</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): The project is in line with regional and national plans. In particular the Tulum +8 Regional Action Plan serves as the foundation for action upon which this project will build along with several other key regional projects and studies discussed in the PIF. National plans related to IW and ICM have been discussed and plans to improve their effectiveness incorporated into the PIF.</p> <p>During PPG thorough consideration needs to be given to building upon these initiatives. In addition, existing and past relevant GEF projects need to be considered. The Caribbean LME, Gulf of Honduras, and MBRS projects are discussed in the PIF, but there are several others, including national level projects, that need to be considered. These include</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the Gulf of Mexico LME (PMIS #5747), Protected Areas, Mexico (#5089), Watershed Management, Mexico (#4792), Coastal and Marine Protected Areas, Guatemala (#4716), MPAs, Honduras (#4708), Golden Stream Watershed, BZ (#2068) and Bay Islands, HN (#1515).</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW):</p> <p>Project Baseline</p> <p>There are several projects noted, but not what was learned and how this project will build on those experiences. What, for example, has happened as a result of Tulum +8 , particularly the action plan? What occurred in MBRS and how will this project build on those lessons? How does the PARCA III (the strategy for CCAD) tie to Tulum+8 plans? There is mention of ecological assessments most recently by TNC in 2008 “ what were the findings of that assessment and how do those tie to plans?</p> <p>Baseline experiences are not provided for all countries. For ICM there is discussion of Belize and Guatamala progress (page 8 and then again on page 10), but not Mexico and Honduras. IW plans for Guatemala and Mexico, including great detail for Guatemala (p 9), but not for Belize and Honduras.</p> <p>There is extensive background on WWF regional projects (p 9-10) suggesting a heavy WWF focus when emphasis needs</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to be on country interests and priorities. Suggest moving WWF experience to an annex.</p> <p>For fisheries (page 11) there is detail on lion fish as invasive species and lobster, but not other fisheries.</p> <p>Discussion needs to be provided for relevant GEF funded projects in the region related to watersheds and coastal/marine ecosystems (MBRS and others).</p> <p>March 24, 2014 (IW): A more comprehensive review of existing and past relevant projects has been provided clarifying the status of national and regional efforts. This additional text clarifies the watershed focus particularly on GT and HN, which host the majority of the watersheds. However, as noted in #5, all relevant GEF projects need to be considered in PPG.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): Overall IW objective 2 and 3 seem most appropriate. Please reconsider objective 1.</p> <p>When originally discussed, this project was intended to have a strong watershed component. The project as written focuses on the coastal and marine environment. The watersheds are considered to the extent that the watershed-based activities threaten the</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. In the Project Framework and Project Strategies text, please ensure clear that TDA and SAP need to be signed by ministers to avoid future confusion.</p> <p>The indicators in the Project Framework Results indicate 'drafted', but the Outcome and the definition (which notes 'validated') indicate should be 'approved'.</p> <p>Please ensure the PFR indicators are quantified. Some do note a specific</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reefs (e.g. pollution, sedimentation ). There is discussion of Tulum+8, which is focused on reef threats; a similar policy framework for watersheds is not identified. To truly be a R2R project, the watershed needs to be addressed in its own right – what are the issues (threats, ecosystem services, governance status, etc) specific to the watersheds . In short, you need to decide whether this is truly a ridge-to-reef project or is it focused on the watersheds or on the MesoAmerican reef. Given the complexities and WWF strengths, it is recommended that you consider focusing on a select set of watersheds rather than addressing the watersheds and MesoAmerican Reef or even the MesoAmerican Reef.</p> <p>The following comments are based on the intent of conducting a truly ridge-to-reef, regional project.</p> <p>The proposal lacks an overall plan for R2R in the region. While the Tulum+8 identifies activities, it is focused on reefs and the action plan lack specificity. There needs to be a watershed through to reef plan to provide the basis for pursuing sustainability of these ecosystems. Lacking such an overarching regional plan to address watershed to reef issues, it is unclear the basis for Component 2 and 3 watershed and reef activities. A regional commitment is imperative to GEF support.</p> <p>Lacking an overall plan, PIF notes sector-</p>	<p>number of outputs; however others (e.g. 2.1.3, 2.3.2/2.3.3/2.3.4/3.1.4/3.2.2/3.2.3 &amp; 3.2.4), are vague noting "increase" or "increased". Appendix 12 has specific targets and baselines indicating these can be quantified. Please specify the expected amount of increase (% if appropriate or target amount).</p> <p>Please explain what constitutes a public-private mechanism in Output 2.2.2.</p> <p>Please provide greater explanation regarding the existing Las Minas Water Fund, including its goal, how it is set-up and what it has achieved. Small point: the text (p49) notes it will be –consolidated', but I think you mean –strengthened' or –highlighted'.</p> <p>Please explain the logic of the Honduras and Belize Water Funds, including if they are intended to provide grants or loan-interest loans. If the latter, please explain how the noted activities are expected to provide a return to pay off the loans or if you are expecting the government to repay the loans based on cost savings.</p> <p>The project addresses a wide breadth of stakeholders, which is important to success. However, given the threat of shoreline and island habitat destruction, the plans for engagement need to include not only the tourism industry, but commercial and residential developers more broadly. Given the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>specific activities without the larger context to clarify why these are specifically a priority. The activities need to address the breath of threats, not focus on specific ones unless there is a clear basis to do so. For example:</p> <p>Â· Component 1 includes an invasive species plan. Why was this prioritized, but not other threats? Especially when Tulum+8 does not highlight invasives as one of the key threats.</p> <p>Â· Component 2 focuses on certification of sugar and oil palm producers, tourism and development “ what about all the other stakeholders, particularly fisheries and aquaculture? Why are these the priority?</p> <p>For a regional project, there needs to be national buy-in by all 4 countries, which is reflected by commitment to pursue strategies in all 4 countries.</p> <p>Â· Component 1 notes establishing 2 policy instruments for IW and ICM will be developed, but only in GT and HN. National plans needs to be considered in all 4 nations. A regional plan needs to be agreed and national level plans need to be developed for all 4 countries.</p> <p>Â· Component 2 activities are focused on GT and HN (2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.3.1). Where is</p>	<p>importance of the cruise ship industry, please ensure they are included in plans.</p> <p>Pleasure ensure plans for the invasive species activities on lion fish as a demo project for regional collaboration (output 1.1.2) is covered by non-GEF funds as this activity is not within the IW GEF-5 strategy.</p> <p>Please ensure 1% of budget is designated to IWLEARN activities and noted in Results Framework.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 All comments addressed besides indicating also in the Pro Doc that 1% of the budget will be dedicated to IW:LEARN activities, as you did in your answer.</p> <p>Also, please note that commercial and residential developers are not strictly part of the tourism industry even though strong links may exist and that the Regional Action Center for the SPAW protocol support coordination on Lionfish actions in the Region (<a href="http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/?Invasive-Lionfish-A-Guide-to,431">http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/?Invasive-Lionfish-A-Guide-to,431</a>).</p> <p>March 30, 2017 (IW): Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the commitment from Mexico and Belize?</p> <p>Â· Component 3 notes building ICZM capacity (3.1.2 &amp; 3.1.3) for Belize and Guatemala. What about Mexico and Honduras?</p> <p>Â· Component 3 notes developing only one policy instrument for ICM in HN or MX. What about Belize and Guatemala's commitment?</p> <p>The focus on specific sectors and specific countries reflects the lack of a regionally agreed plan to address the breadth of issues in all 4 countries.</p> <p>Given these concerns, consideration needs to be given to not only conducting the planned TDA (although see points below), but also feeding such a TDA into a regional plan/SAP for R2R (i.e. an expanded Tulum +8 that would incorporate watersheds).</p> <p>There needs to be consideration of a governance structure for R2R in the region. Will CCAD be directly managing the regional activities or another body? In the case of MBRS, CCAD did not directly manage, but set-up a separate body in Belize to work with all 4 nations. What is the plan for this project and where will it be based?</p> <p>The most appropriate IW focal area given</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the focus on developing plans seems to be IW-3.</p> <p>Note the text in the Components and Table B need to be consistent.</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>1.1.1 is in line with the idea of developing a regional R2R plan/ SAP, but needs to be expanded to emphasize identifying goals and priorities, etc.</p> <p>1.1.2 In addition the above points about the invasive species program being included, an invasives species program would be funded under Biodiversity, not IW.</p> <p>1.3 While the TDA activity proposed is important, it needs to go beyond an ecological assessment and also consider the socioeconomic and governance aspects (please see TDA guidance). It also needs to be clear that it is conducted for the entire region, not one watershed. And in this regard, it needs to address not only reef threats and issues, but also watershed, which is beyond the previous ecological assessments that focused on reefs.</p> <p>1.4 These activities seem more in line with Component 4. Also 1.4.1 needs to include watershed information, not just coastal/marine.</p> <p>Component 2</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2.1 IWRM plans need to be developed before being implemented.</p> <p>While protected areas are important, there needs to be consideration of strategies specific to pollution, sedimentation, habitat destruction and other threats to the watershed. "Better management practices" needs to be more specific. Strategies might include regulations, standards and incentives. Instead the focus seems to be on funds and stakeholder engagement, which are useful tools but the real action is with strategies. The development of a TDA and then SAP that consider the watershed is important in this regard.</p> <p>Relateldy, there need to be activities to either develop a national IW plan when one does not exist and update and/or implement existing IW plans.</p> <p>Component 4</p> <p>As suggested above, 1.4 seems more appropriate under Component 4.</p> <p>4.1 is standard practice to projects and does not need to be included in the "Component", but rather in the rest of the text.</p> <p>4.2 Need to consider breadth of knowledge sharing within the project and therefore between the 4 countries “ hosting regional meetings/workshops on</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>topics, participating in regional meetings/conferences, exchange of stakeholders, website, blogs, listserves, etc.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 (IW): The above points have been addressed. Explanation has been provided regarding national commitment to CCAD execution. Consideration has been given to implementation in all 4 countries and a more comprehensive explanation has been provided for the watershed focus on HN and GT, which host the vast majority of the watersheds.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, the project will enable the four nations to work together toward implementing the Tulum+8 regional protocol and build upon other existing initiatives to ensure the sustainability of the globally significant MesoAmerican Barrier Reef. Further, the project will demonstrate the value of the ridge-to-reef approach through engagement of a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, the breadth of stakeholders are articulated in the PIF and will need to be further refined in terms of their participation during the</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	engagement explained?	PPG phase.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes a matrix sufficiently identifying and addressing potential risks and their consequences is provided.	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes, as described #6 and #7.	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. The relevant projects are noted and it is good to see CLME+ highlighted. However, given the importance of linking with CLME+, there needs to be more explanation regarding how they will collaborate. Specifically, how will the two regional bodies collaborate given MARR2R region is within the CLME+ region? Plans for collaboration with OSPECA and SICA also need to be explained.  February 22, 2017 Yes, addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for</li> </ul>	March 24, 2014 (IW): The project is unique in that it provides a ridge-to-reef approach for ensuring the sustainability of the globally significant MesoAmerican Barrier Reef. The project will essentially implement the regionally agreed Tulum+8 Regional Action Plan and build on other relevant regional and national efforts, which will help ensure the sustainability of the project. Further, the nations have agreed on the CCAD as the appropriate executing agency to host and execute the project, which is in line with the long-term mandate of the institution	July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes. [specifics to be added once comments addressed]  March 27, 2017 (lkarrer). Yes. The project is unique in that it provides a ridge-to-reef approach for ensuring the sustainability of the globally significant MesoAmerican Barrier Reef. The project will essentially implement the regionally agreed Tulum+8 Regional Action Plan and build on other relevant regional and national efforts, which will help ensure the sustainability of the project. Further, the nations have agreed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.	and further ensures institutional sustainability. With demonstration activities an important part of the project, scaling up is considered integral to the project. Similarly, Component 4 addresses sharing lessons learned throughout the region and globally to further ensure the project successes are scaled up.	on the CCAD as the appropriate executing agency to host and execute the project, which is in line with the long-term mandate of the institution and further ensures institutional sustainability. With demonstration activities an important part of the project, scaling up is considered integral to the project. Similarly, Component 4 addresses sharing lessons learned throughout the region and globally to further ensure the project successes are scaled up.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 24, 2014 (IW): Yes.	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. The decline in amounts is well explained and it is good to see the addition of a new contribution from the Health Reef Initiative and increases from several other sources, include a dramatic increase from FUNDAECO.</p> <p>The co-financing letter from Healthy Reef Initiative amount does not match the amount in Table B. Please correct. Please ensure that as a result the letters' total add up to the submissoin. Currently the letters sum to \$50685908 and the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>amount noted in the submission is \$51277908.</p> <p>Given the interest in communication and knowledge sharing, has consideration been given to including a Communications and Knowledge Sharing Officer?</p> <p>February 22, 2017 Yes, addressed.</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes.</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW). See point in #7 regarding removing component 4, which includes management costs.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 (IW). Yes.</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>March 19, 2014 (IW): Yes.</p>	<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		<p>NA</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. #14 only focuses on IWRM; however there are ICM, MSP and MPA efforts underway in the region. Please include. For #15, reduced fishing pressure, conserved/protected wetland, MPAs and fish refugia and invasive species would all seem appropriate to include.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 Yes, addressed.</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. The outputs in the Results Framework are limited and do not reflect the suite of mechanisms noted in the text (p57 Pro Doc), e.g. regional conferences, workshops and meetings as well as through internet-based means, such as webinars (e.g. EBM Tools webinars). In addition please clarify that experiences will be shared (two-way interactions) with the projects noted in RCE A.7. RCE Annex A is missing Outcome 4.1 Indicators for Outcome 4.2 need to include indicators for discussing experiences e.g. participation in webinars, conferences, workshops, meetings in region and globally.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 Yes, addressed.</p>
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No.</p> <p>The RCE and Pro Doc have not sufficiently addressed the point that the project needs to work toward</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>development of a regional governance framework, which is particularly important for institutional sustainability following this project. This point is particularly relevant for inclusion in the SAP. This framework will need to synchronize national and regional concerns, incentives and benefits as noted by STAP.</p> <p>Both STAP and Germany noted the need for stronger CCAD capacity in MSP, which does not seem to be addressed. While there is a staff person for ICM, their expertise will need to be much broader than only MSP.</p> <p>February 22, 2017 No, could you please also add the MSP capacity building in the activities description?</p> <p>March 27, 2017 (lkarrer). Yes, addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		<p>July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. USA requested an explanation of plans for coordination with OSPECA and SICA, which needs to be explained in the Pro Doc and RCE (Request for CEO Endorsement).</p> <p>March 27, 2017. Yes, addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	March 24, 2014 (IW). Yes, the project is recommended for approval.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		July 29, 2016 (lkarrer). No. Please address the above comments.  February 22, 2017 No, please address the remaining comment.  March 27, 2017 (lkarrer). Yes, Addressed
	First review*		August 06, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		February 22, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)		March 27, 2017

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