



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

GEF ID:	<b>4629</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Maldives</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Low-Carbon Energy Island Strategies</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-2; CCM-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,885,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$21,250,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$25,135,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>David Elrie Rodgers</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Conrado S. Heruela</b>

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?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes. Mr. Ahmed Saleem, GEF OFP, endorsed the project on 22 August 2011 for "approximately " \$4.4 M inclusive of PPG.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. No non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	

\*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)
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011.</p> <p>a) No, however, Maldives is choosing to use its flexible STAR allocation and combine focal area allocations. The project requests \$4m, but CC allocation is only \$2m. Therefore the document should include an explanation by the government for the process it used to determine the appropriateness of using this funding from other focal areas. This project alone will use most of the \$5.45M total STAR allocation.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Comment addressed in the review sheet response, but this information should be included in the PIF. Please clarify.</p> <p>b) Also, please ensure that Table D is appropriately filled in with a separate row for each focal area amount.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Table D is not filled in. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. Table D is correctly filled in. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.

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>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. In Table A, is there supposed to be an outcome 2.3? It does not show up. Please clarify. Also, for Table A, please show each outcome on a separate row with the amount of funding attributable to that outcome.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Table A has been filled out with a separate row for each outcome. However, there is a mismatch between the Outcome 2.2 (Investment mobilized) which shows \$3.65 M, and the lack of an investment component in the project. Please clarify in Table B which components are investment being funded with the \$3.65 M.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The investment components have been indicated. Comment cleared. GEF investment totals \$1.9 M. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. No. Section A.1.1 does not describe the focal area strategies, but instead documents Maldives commitment. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. CCM-2 is identified and Section A.1.1 is updated. Thank you. However, there is no mention in Table A or A.1.1 of meeting CCM-3, renewable energy, objectives. Yet part of the project description says (page 21): "This GEF project will complement the SREP as follows: 1)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Conduct pilot demonstration projects on RE systems, which will be scaled up under SREP, the experience generated in the pilot demonstration projects will provide inputs in designing the scaling up approaches and strategies</p> <p>2) The pilot demonstration projects will serve also to validate the policy and implementation guidelines for promoting investments in RE systems by PPPs." These appear to be inconsistent with CCM-2 and involve CCM-3. Please clarify if this project will allocate GEF resources for RE components, and if so, update the focal area objectives appropriately.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The project does not include RE elements and the PIF has been updated. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<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>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. The project is consistent with Maldives national communications.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.</p>	
	<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>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. No. The provided material is more a description of the baseline scenario. We would expect more description of the plans the government has in place for promoting energy efficiency or improving building</p>	

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>construction without the GEF grant. For example, the paragraph at the bottom of page 11 "current efforts in promoting energy efficient buildings" should be about 3 times as long and include government programs and policies that will be applicable over the next 5 years under the baseline project. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. The baseline project still cannot be identified. We recommend a consultation with the agency and GEFSEC to ensure a shared understanding of what will be needed for an adequate baseline project description.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The baseline efforts are focused on energy efficiency roadmaps for buildings; the incremental project will expand and enhance those efforts with an emphasis on low-emission tropical architecture. Comment cleared.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes, however, the document needs to include more information on the tropical conditions and architecture issues that will be addressed by this effort, and how project will contribute innovative solutions on	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>these issues. In other words, please justify why this is not just another standard buildings project.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Some additional information was added that is helpful, however, it is still not possible to justify the incremental reasoning due to the lack of a baseline project.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The revised PIF more clearly describes the incremental activities, however, Section B2 does not provide any estimate of the global environmental benefits. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. The revised PIF estimates annual GHG emissions reductions of 216,000 to 231,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e due to the project. At CEO endorsement, we would expect a clear analysis of how the project will deliver 75% to 80% penetration of EE technologies needed to achieve these benefits. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. Due to project re-design, estimates reduced to 86,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e annually. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Please address the following comments.</p> <p>a) component 4 should include adoption by the government of policies deemed important for promoting energy efficiency buildings.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) component 5 - the outcomes which look for the most part quite good, don't seem well linked with the outputs</p> <p>c) Component 5 is labeled TA. This should be an investment component.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. for b) and c): the descriptions in this component are so lengthy and detailed, it is not discernible what is being proposed. It is critical to separate the "policy, regulatory framework" which is TA, from the "financing for transformation" which should be investment. Please design this as two separate components.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The components have been separated and are better described. Investment is explicitly included. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) component 5 includes element on street lighting. This is okay, but need to better explain how street lighting and building efficiency are complementary</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. The street lighting element is not described. The investment portion can not be discerned. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The component is better described. Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) Component 6 is more clear about</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>adoption of strong policies. Consider combining component 4 and 6 to simplify the project design.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Some changes were made, but they are difficult to follow. Please clarify where component 6 elements were moved to.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The component is better described. Comment cleared.</p> <p>f) component 3 write-up on page 14 discusses GEF funding as "seed funding" for a financial mechanism. This could be a very valuable approach, building on the virtues of non-grant instruments and encouraging a revolving fund type application. But the funding allocated to component 3 is labeled as TA and appears quite low for this concept. Please document the amount of this component that will be investment, and show on a separate row. Some additional explanation of the details of the mechanism would be helpful.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Any changes made in Table B and Section B.2 cannot readily be identified. No components are marked as investment. We recommend a consultation with the agency and GEFSEC to ensure a shared understanding of why investment is critical.</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>DER, December 12, 2011. The component is better described, and the investment portion is delineated. Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) Please make sure the write-up of components in Table B matches the write-up in the document on pages 13-15</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The description of component 1 in column 1 of Table B on page 2 does not match the description on page 18. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, March 6, 2012. In order to make a substantive impact with the level of resources being allocated for this project, the bulk of the resources should be for investment. The need for road maps, training, policy support, and the like is less important than creating a direct impact through strong investment components. Please redesign the project to minimize the soft components (1,2,3,5) and re-direct the emphasis to investment components 4 and 6. The components should be redesigned to deliver tangible deliverables, such as new and upgraded buildings, energy efficiency appliance and lighting installations. Specific islands that have the capacity to support investment should be identified and targeted.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. The project design</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		has been significantly changed to include only two investment components focused on testing and deploying low-carbon and energy efficient technologies in three building sectors. Comment cleared.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Please clarify the incremental aspects of the project relative to the re-written baseline description.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Still unclear. See comments in boxes 13 and 14.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. Please describe the global environmental benefits in Section B2.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. An estimate has been provided that 30% of the fast-track target. Comment 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?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	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)	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	

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?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes., however, the section on coordination should include mention of coordination efforts with the IPEEC/sustainable building network.  DER, Sept. 28, 2011. IPEEC coordination is included. Comment cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Yes.	
	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?	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. No. Project management cannot exceed 5% of the GEF funding (in this case, cannot exceed \$200,000) without clear justification. If the project is self-executed by UNEP, then GEF funding for project management must be zero. Please clarify.  DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Please supply information requested - is UNEP executing the program?  Also, footnote 5 on page 5 does not make sense.  DER, December 12, 2011. UNEP is not the executing agency. Project management cost is at 5%. Comment	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>cleared.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. To be determined. a) Table C on co-financing is not filled in. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011.</p> <p>b) Also, please adjust Table A, B, and C to equal the same total funding for GEF and co-financing.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Tables have been adjusted. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Funding levels for each component need to be carefully analyzed and adjusted.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. The funding for each component needs to be justified and adjusted. There is no justification for the various components financing levels, and mix of TA versus Investment. Until the Investment components are separated out, the level of funding cannot be assessed as "appropriate or adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs."</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The investment components have been delineated. The funding levels are appropriate. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, March 6, 2012. Please adjust the GEF financing and the co-financing allocations so the bulk of all 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>resources goes to components 4 and 6. Funding for components 1,2,3, and 5 should be eliminated or reduced to minimal levels.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. Adjustments were made as requested. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. The co-financing is low. We aim for 5:1 or 7:1 co-financing to GEF ratio. Please identify additional sources of co-financing.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Until the baseline project is clearly articulated, it is uncertain which of the co-financing should be counted as part of this project. For example, as currently described, renewable energy investments cannot be justified as eligible for counting as co-financing for this project.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. The co-financing ratio is just barely adequate. During PPG, we anticipate additional co-financing will be identified. At the endorsement stage, we expect confirmation of all co-financing. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. yes.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	DER, Sept. 2, 2011. N/A.	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>DER, Sept. 2, 2011. Not at this time. Please address the comments in boxes 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 23, and 24.</p> <p>DER, Sept. 28, 2011. Several comments have been addressed, but comments remain in boxes 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, and 24. Substantial comments regarding the need for a strong baseline and a strong investment component have not yet been addressed. Co-financing is unclear. It is recommended to have a consultation between the proposing agency and GEFSEC staff to help move the PIF forward.</p> <p>DER, December 12, 2011. Most comments are cleared. Please address remaining comments in box 13, 14(g), 15. Also, the project resources request is \$4.2 M plus agency fee of \$420,000 which equals \$4.62 M. When the PPG of \$124,000 and agency fee of \$12,400 is added, the grand total resources requested becomes \$4.756 M. This is substantially larger than 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>endorsement letter which says "approximately \$4.4 M inclusive of PPG." Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. Not at this time. Comments cleared in boxes 13, 14, and 15.</p> <p>Project was not included in the intersessional work program.</p> <p>DER, March 6, 2012. Additional review of the proposal has identified a need to significantly strengthen the investment portions of the proposal in order to make a substantive impact. Please see comments in boxes 14 and 24. GEF/Agency consultation is recommended to help with project re-design.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>DER, April 9, 2012.</p> <p>a) At the time of endorsement, please provide specific details about the financial mechanisms and investment approaches.</p> <p>b) The revised PIF estimates annual GHG emissions reductions of 86,000 to 144,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e due to the project. At CEO endorsement, we would expect a clear analysis of how the project will deliver 30% of the fast-track targets needed to achieve these benefits.</p> <p>c) Maldives successful efforts in this area could be a model for other SIDS, as noted on page 21. Please include documentation in the CEO endorsement on project outputs that can be disseminated as best practices.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 02, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 12, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 06, 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. 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?	<p>DER, December 12, 2011.</p> <p>a) Component A is confusing and repetitive. "location of demonstration projects" is listed 3 times, this item is also referenced under component C. Please remove duplication and reduce costs accordingly.</p> <p>b) There is no reference to existing energy efficiency road-maps which presumably have much of this assessment data already. Please clarify and consider reducing this component.</p> <p>c) Finalization of project documents should not be included in the PPG.</p> <p>d) Financing mechanisms is included under both component b and component C. Please clarify.</p> <p>e) Will any of the PPG activities cover the low-carbon energy (LCE) technologies from component 4? Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. Clarifications were included for each comment. All comments cleared.</p> <p>DER, April 9, 2012. As the project design has fundamentally changed, the PPG</p>



		<p>should be adjusted to match.</p> <p>a) components A, B, and C appear unnecessary. Only components A(b) and A(c) appear to match the redesigned project. Please justify all other sub-components or remove.</p> <p>b) Recommend you focus during PPG phase on identification of candidates for pilot demonstrations of technologies in social housing, government buildings, and tourism related buildings as noted in components A(b) and A(c).</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The PPG has been completely redesigned to support the project components. The activities are appropriate and well described.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>DER, December 12, 2011.</p> <p>a) The costs are very high for this type of project. Please reduce the costs.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. The cost has been reduced. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The project resources request is \$4.2 M plus agency fee of \$420,000 which equals \$4.62 M. When the PPG of \$124,000 and agency fee of \$12,400 is added, the grand total resources requested becomes \$4.756 M. This is substantially larger than the endorsement letter as indicated in box 30 of the PIF review. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. The reduced PPG amount is shown correctly in Tables B, C, D and Table E. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>DER, December 12, 2011. Not at this time. Please address the comments.</p> <p>DER, January 3, 2012. Yes.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>DER, April 12, 2012. Given the urgency to accomplish project activities so that energy efficiency can be incorporated into social housing, we encourage the agency to complete the project design phase as quickly as possible.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 12, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 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.