



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

GEF ID:	4746		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)		
Project Title:	Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	4607 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$10,000,000
Co-financing:	\$84,934,375	Total Project Cost:	\$95,134,375
PIF Approval:	April 06, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Frank Chopin

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 country eligible?	[AH 12/14/11] No, Tokelau is not a eligible GEF country. It cannot be included in the proposal as it stands, but can participate in the project with non-GEF funding.  [AH 1/4/12] Tokelau has been removed from the proposal.	31st of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, all participating countries are eligible
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	[AH 12/14/11] GEF Operational Focal Point Letters of Endorsement are still missing for the Marshall Islands, Nauru, PNG, and Solomon Islands. In addition, the OFP for Tonga differs from who we	

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>have listed on file - Dr. Nailasikau HALATUITUIA.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] LOEs for Marshall Islands, Nauru, and Solomon Islands have been provided. PNG has been removed from the project at this time, but, as the PIF states, "... is expected to formally endorse the project and once the endorsement letter is provided to GEF, it will be included as a participating country at CEO endorsement"</p> <p>Further, "The Government of Tonga has advised that Dr. Halatuituia has been replaced as Head of Environment and as the GEF Operational Focal Point by Mr Asipeli Palaki, Director of Environment and Climate Change, but this change is still in the process of being communicated to the GEF."</p> <p>[AH 4/2/12] The Letter of Endorsement from the PNG OFP has been submitted. All 14 countries have now submitted Letters of Endorsement.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	<p>3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?</p> <p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, UNDP successfully carried out the predecessor OFMP project and is well established in the region. FAO's comparative advantage in rights-based management fisheries will enhance this proposal's likelihood of success.</p> <p>[AH 12/14/11] N/A</p>	<p>31st of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, Indirectly the comparative advantages of the two agencies, have been described in section 2.2.2</p> <p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): NA</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, proposal is well aligned with UNDP successful predecessor OFMP project complemented by the technical expertise of FAO fisheries staff. However, please elaborate how this proposal fits into FAO's agency program in section C.2  [AH 1/4/12] Addressed.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, according to the Implementation arrangement description included.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	[AH 12/14/11] A total of \$10M is being requested from IW, split evenly between UNDP (\$5M) and FAO (\$5M).	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well aligned with the GEF-5 IW results framework, specifically related to improving LME management of the WCP Warm Water Pool.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin+cgobin):The included results framework in the ProDoc pp 52 - 63 provides a number of overarching targets (ie pp 53) and even associated with a baseline including quantifiable indicators. In general the outputs suggested in the Results framework are very wordy formulations, please revise so that they become more directed towards an actual set of outputs. The inclusion of long term targets

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>beyond the life of the project is welcomed however, those targets cannot replace the need of clear and measurable targets achievable during the project life. Furthermore, a set of quantifiable indicators needs to be develop to evaluate the project impact regarding GEBs. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>- How will the effectiveness of the CMMs applied to all four major target stocks be measured?? please provide an output indicator to this target. The indicator of "extent of application of WCPFC to major target/non target stocks" is not easy measurable.</p> <p>- output 1.2.2: while this output makes sense, having the # of people trained as a target for this process may not be the best indicator Maybe it would be better to have establishment of a knowledge hub (web catalogue or the like) where all these national documents would be avialable from??</p> <p>- Output 2.1.1 this is a binary output indicator, how will it be determined if the "weakness in the purse seine VDs have been properly addressed? it seems that it will be hard to do an objective assessment of this. Please provide explanation and/or reformulation of target indicator.</p> <p>- OUtcome 3.1: Baseline does not include a numeric value. Please include</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 able to give value to the target indicator. This is a persisting issue through out this outcome and its associated output baselines.</p> <p>- Outcome 3.2: will this data being housed in each country or will be it hosted in a a central place or will the system be based on nationally hosted datasets, that then through some internet based facility will be linked and accessible from one platform??</p> <p>- will a Community of practice be formed around the national staff that will be trained throught the project?? this may be a good approach to make sure they keep in touch and keep informing each other. Please consider.</p> <p>Please insert an output indicator targetted towards the coordination with the ABNJ portfolio of projects, as a number of them will be targetting their interventions in the same area and with multiple of them overlapping especially on the targetted species. Such coordination arrangements have been sporatic mentioned here and there in the PRODOC, but as it is understood to be essential towards reaching not only the individual project objectives, but also potential synergies between the different project, it needs to be much more apparent that this will happen.</p> <p>16th of June 2014 (cseverin &amp; cgobin):</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Addressed.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well aligned with Objective Two of the GEF-5 IW Strategy	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, GEF 5 IW Obejective 2 has correctly been identified
	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?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal was designed specifically to help countries meet their global and regional obligations, specifically to the Western Central Pacific Commission under the Western Central Pacific Convention. Additionally, this project was designed in harmony with the Pacific Islands Forum Fishing Agency Convention (FFA) as well as other regional agreements such as Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA).	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): yes the proposed project is still in line with the Pacific countries national strategies as well as fully in line with the regional organsiations strategies.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	[AH 12/14/11] Sustainability is key to the success of this proposal and was well demonstrated in the preceding project. This proposal alludes to sustainable actions, but it would be best if concrete plans for sustaining the actions outlined are demonstrated in this PIF, especially for Component 3.  [AH 1/4/12] Sustainability of the project is now better addressed in the PIF.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, there is a strong linkage between eh capacities to be developed during project implementation and the successfulness of the project and its activities. Further, the project wil be working towards increasing local and regional capacity towards long term sustainability.
	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?	[AH 12/14/11] The overall proposal design is sound and well developed over the last three years. It takes guidance directly from the Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP OFMP project, which highlighted the outstanding issues and means for addressing them.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): The mandates from the numerous agencies in the region is addressing the issues that the proposed project is to deal with. However, it is not possible to clearly understand what the underlying baseline investments will be to this proposed investment, specifically the national

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design			<p>investments.</p> <p>It is understood that this project will be building on the successful "Pacific Islands Oceanic fisheries Management PProject", but that is not baseline enough, the baseline investments have to be also consisting of activities and investments that are not GEF investments.</p> <p>16th of June 2014 (cseverin): Addressed</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>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): The proposed operation mode of the project will by addressing the issues at hand, working with all relevant stakeholders, be more cost effective, that trying to tackle this complex regional issue but with strong international linkages. Most likely, it would not be able to even address this issue if not done in the proposed manner.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, incremental reasoning is sound for the proposal as the baseline from which GEF funds are providing additionality are the global and regional agreements that the SIDS have obligations to meet. The main emphasis of the project, and GEF funding, is to help individual countries meet obligations for sound stewardship of the WCP Warm Water Pool LME.</p>	<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes the incremental reasoning is adequate.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Overall, the proposal's framework is sound. However, many of the Expected Outputs listed in Table B (Project Framework) are too qualitative. Please provide descriptions of project</p>	<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): please see comments under cell 7. The outputs are too descriptive and generally needs to be more targetted towards being better linked to the, more</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outputs that are measurable, e.g. X number of meetings held, X number of country programs implemented, etc. Avoid words such as updated, strengthened, and improved as they can not be measured.</p> <p>Project components are processes versus activities, and lead to vague outputs. For example ,multiple donors have been involved in this Output 1.2.2 Assessment of fisheries jurisdictional implications of climate change and related training. Would encourage to revise structure to focus on activities rather than processes at regional/sub-regional and national level which should be part of the implementation arrangements.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] The Project Framework has been reworked and provides more specific actions yielding measurable goals.</p>	<p>often than not, very detailed and numeric baseline.</p> <p>(cgobin):p10, it is mentioned that the project will encouraged the development of domestic fleets, please explain how this activity will fit with the main objective to reduce the current overcapacity at regional level. Please bear in mind that GEF supports transition to more sustainable fisheries but will not fund activity to increase fleet capacity.</p> <p>p41: it is mentioned that market oriented action will be developed, please further develop what these actions will consist of.</p> <p>16th of June 2014 (cseverin+cgobin) addressed in Prodoc and reflected upon in responds matrix</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The proposal methodology follows the lessons learned from the UNDP OFMP project and is based on field experience and the OFMP Terminal Evaluation. Therefore the description of additionality is sound.</p>	<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): The proposed project will be building on the outcomes and outputs from the "Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project", which is planned to be leading to, especially, regional management strategies for the targetted fisheries.</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/</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The overall goal of this proposal, as well as the global and regional instruments it will address, is to improve the welfare of these Pacific SIDS. Because the main source of food and income to these SIDS is fish,</p>	<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin+cgobin):yes, the project includes gender specific output indicators, while also addressing multiple other socio economic aspects. However, please clarify how the project</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?	<p>improving the management of fish stocks will directly improve livelihoods, both socially and economically. The proposal lacks a clear focus on gender benefits, other than to note that job creation will lead to significantly more land-based jobs for women.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Issues of gender have been stressed in the new PIF above a generic baseline.</p>	<p>will deal with the current fisheries fleet overcapacities while increasing the development of domestic fleet, as mentioned p10. Finally, it is not clear how the expected benefits of the project will be sustained. For example, could you confirm that the 70 on-board observers will be maintained and with which financial support. Which partner will cover the future cost of the fisheries' certification assessment: government, retailers?</p> <p>16th of June 2014 (Cseverin &amp; cgobin): The prodoc describes how in theory the overcapacity will be dealt with, however, the application of this theoretical description will need considerable political will. Furthermore, the prodoc clearly describes how the activities will be sustained through marked based mechanisms.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	[AH 12/14/11] Public participation is being considered through two avenues. First, with the inclusion of the regional fishing industry and private business, including the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITA). NGOs and CSOs are being included with the help of WWF.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, specifically component 4, output 4.1.1 has been targetted towards addressing this.
	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>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, many major risks are noted, including issues related to climate change. However, please be sure to move the Risk Matrix on page 13 under the proper section (B.4)</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed.</p>	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the project document includes a detailed risk matrix including mitigation measures. Climate Change has been included as having potential effects on the targetted fisheries.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well coordinated with related initiatives in the region, largely because this proposal is supported by many of the regional IGOs, including the FFA and SPC, and was developed in response to the needs identified by the Terminal Evaluation of the OFMP. It would be in the proposal's best interest to work closely with FAO	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin+cgobin): To some extent, the description on the coordination with the ABNJ portfolio is not strong enough and lack concrete output indicators. For example, some suggested activities (e.g. 1.2.1) are overlapping with actions developed by the Tuna ABNJ project. Furthermore, the project would gain extending its partnership to other partners such as ISSF or CMS with regard to their program in IUU or shark data collection.  16th of June 2014 (cseverin & cgobin): coordination mechanisms have been described and included in the prodoc.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, execution of the project will be conducted by the main regional bodies - FFA and SPC, which will ensure proper local ownership and national and regional coordination.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	[AH 12/14/11] Project management for this proposal is \$475,000 with co-financing of \$2,124,000. This is a ratio of 1:4.5 and is 4.9% of the total GEF grant, which is appropriate per current GEF policies.	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes the PM cost is in appropriate and following GEF guidance

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The overall proposal GEF:co-financing ratio is 1:7, with components 1-4 respectively 1:10, 1:5.8, 1:7.3, and 1:4.9.</p> <p>Please make sure that the text states that at least 1% of the total GEF grant go towards IW:LEARN activities (p.11) instead of approximately 1%.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed.</p>	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin):Yes
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The indicated co-financing is strong at over \$70M, including over \$37M of grant funds from FFA. It would be in the proposal's best interest to see more buy-in from WWF, who has only contributed \$200,000 of in-kind support, as their efforts to work with local CSOs and NGOs will be important for the future sustainability of this proposal.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed. We look forward to seeing WWF's level of commitment to this proposal at time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes confirmed cofinancing totaling more than \$84 mio have been included.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, since UNDP implemented the previous OFMP and has more on-the-ground experience with this project, it is logical to see them providing more co-financing than FAO - \$3.0M and \$500,000, respectively. Though, it would be in the proposal's best interest to see more in-kind support from FAO as demonstration of their investment in the proposal.</p>	2nd of April 2014 (cseverin):Yes the two implementing agencies are bringing co-financing to the project in line with their roles.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		[AH 1/4/12] Addressed. We look forward to seeing increased co-financing at time of CEO Endorsement.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes the IW TT has been included, however, since the proposed project is suggesting to update the TDA as well as renew the political endorsement of an updated SAP, how will this process be harnessed in the TT, as it already shows 100 % compliance on these two issues (relates to output 1.2.3 in RF)</p> <p>Please advice or consider to report seperately on the renewed TDA/SAP process.</p> <p>16th of June 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): Yes, pp 102 of ProDoc for the actual ME table, but this is also linked to the detailed results framework.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<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>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Please note that comments have been provided by the World Bank</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] The most recently submitted PIF includes responses to the comments provided by the World Bank. The responses provided seem adequate.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] No, recommendation is not being given at this stage. Please address the issues noted above, especially the missing endorsement letters, the issue of the Tonga OFP and the inclusion of Tokelau.</p> <p>Please note that proposals must be approved for the February Intersessional Work Program by January 6th</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Yes, the proposal is being recommended at this time.</p> <p>[AH 1/17/12] This PIF will not be included in the February 2012 Intersessional Work Program. However, it may be reconsidered for a future work program.</p> <p>[AH 4/2/12] The PIF is being recommended for the June 2012 Work Program.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>[AH 1/4/12] Please be sure to work with the government of PNG to have their full support of and participating in this project by time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<p>32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?</p>		
	<p><b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b></p>		<p>2nd of April 2014 (cseverin): No, please address above comments.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			18th of June 2014 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 14, 2011	April 02, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	June 16, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 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?	[AH 4/2/12] Yes, the proposed PPG activities are limited to project preparation and are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	[AH 4/2/12] No, there are two budget issues.  1) The Regional Lead Consultant is tasked with acting as, "... PPG team leader responsible for coordinating all activities and reviewing the reports of the local and other international consultants." for a duration of 13 weeks. However, the local consultant is listed with 14 weeks of duration - one longer than the lead consultant who is responsible for, "... coordinating all activities and reviewing the reports of the local and other international consultants." Please correct so that lead consultant is able to properly coordinate.  2) The PPG cofinancing is too low. It is recommended that, at a very minimum, the PPG have GEF to cofinancing ratio of 1:3.  [AH 6/29/12] PPG cofinancing has been increased from \$170,000 to \$617,500.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	[AH 4/2/12] No, the PPG is not being recommended for approval at this time. Please address the issues identified above and resubmit.  [AH 6/29/12] No, the PPG is not being recommended for approval at this time. The PPG is still inconsistent with the number of countries as mentioned in the box

		<p>below. Please quickly correct and resubmit.</p> <p>[AH 7/12/12] Yes, all outstanding issued have been addressed. The PPG is now being recommended for approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>[AH 4/2/12] Please note that there are 14 countries now named as participating in this project, but Section B of the PPG says 13. Please update.</p> <p>Please also remove references to the LDCF in Annex A. The proposed project is not requesting funding from LDCF.</p> <p>[AH 6/29/12] Papua New Guinea is now missing from the list of countries at the top of the PPG (but was included in the previous PPG submission). PNG was listed as a country in the approved PIF and this resubmitted PPG states 14 countries will benefit from PPG funds, yet only 13 countries are listed. Please correct this issue.</p> <p>Also, LDCF is still mentioned in Annex A in reference to GEF/LDCF guidelines. Please note that the International Waters focal area is part of the GEF Trust Fund and as indicated in the approved PIF, is the only source of funds being requested. The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) under the UNFCCC and therefore LDCF guidelines do not need to be followed for preparation of the project documents.</p> <p>[AH 7/12/12] The above issues have been addressed.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 02, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 26, 2012

\* 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.