



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

GEF ID:	<b>4801</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Vietnam</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promotion of Non-fired Brick (NFB) Production and Utilization</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4546 (UNDP)</b>
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; CCM-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$95,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,800,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$36,080,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$38,880,000</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>Faris Khader</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, January 25, 2012. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, January 25, 2012. Yes. The project was endorsed for \$3.19 M, including \$2.8 M for the grant, \$100,000 for the PPG, and \$290,000 for the agency fee, on 30 November 2011 by Dr. Nguyen Van Tai, GEF Operational Focal Point, Director General, ISPONRE/MONRE	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, January 25, 2012. No. Due to the strong baseline efforts, including strong decrees by the Government of Vietnam to require non-fired bricks, incremental	

\*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>reasoning for a GEF project would have to be more strongly justified based on strong investment components that fall into the comparative advantage of the multi-lateral development banks.</p> <p>April 12, 2012. The project has been re-scoped to include a strong investment component that will be supported, but not operated by, the implementing agency. The agency has the experience to provide this support. Comment cleared.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. No non-grant instrument.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The re-designed project will support a revolving loan program implemented by local financial institutions. The agency is capable of supporting the establishment through technical assistance but will not manage the non-grant.</p>	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, January 25, 2012. Yes.	
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, January 25, 2012. Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA	DER, January 25, 2012. NA	

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, January 25, 2012. NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	DER, January 25, 2012. Yes the project is CCM-2, energy efficiency.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DER, January 25, 2012. Table A is not quite right. Please do not list outcome 2.3 separately with its own grant and co-financing. The grant and co-financing should be distributed among the outcomes 2.1 and 2.2.  DER, April 12, 2012. Table A has been updated. Comment 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?	DER, January 25, 2012. No. See box 11, 12, 13, and 14. It is very likely the demonstration outputs of this project will be moot due to the baseline scenario.  DER, April 12, 2012. The project's aims are consistent with recipient country's strategies and regulations. The agency has made a strong case in the revised PIF that without the GEF project the industry will not be able to meet the manufacturing levels for non-fired bricks under the regulations. Therefore the demonstrations and financial aid in this project can facilitate efforts beyond the baseline scenario. Comment cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	DER, January 25, 2012. No.	

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>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, January 25, 2012. The description of the baseline project reports clearly that the Government of Vietnam has issued requirements for the gradual replacement of clay-fired bricks with non-fired bricks in construction works to 20-25 per cent by 2015 and 30-40 per cent by 2020, and documents heavy government investment in non-fired brick making. The baseline efforts are robust and maturing rapidly during the nearly two years since the decree on non-fired bricks was issued. One Vietnamese manufacturer already has "20 years of experience in researching and manufacturing non-burnt building materials, especially cement tile, paver and block products; A chain of 4 production factories to form the biggest cement tile and paver producer in Vietnam using equipment from world-leading manufacturers such as OCEM, Casani, Breton (Italy), Rometa (Spain), MASA-Handuk (Germany-Korea), Nakano (Japan)...., A manufacturing system with advanced management tools such as ISO-9001:2000, ...." Clearly, the industrial non-fired brick making sector is highly mature.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The agency has made a strong case in the revised PIF that without the GEF project the industry will not be able to meet the manufacturing levels for non-fired bricks under the regulations. Therefore the demonstrations and financial aid in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this project can facilitate efforts beyond the baseline scenario. Comment cleared for the PIF. At CEO endorsement we expect to see a more clear description of the barriers preventing foreign and domestic owned NFB manufacturers from growing their market, especially if they have an installed base of modern technologies.</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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. Due to the very strong baseline project, the PIF would need to clearly articulate incremental benefits from a GEF project over and above the baseline. The explanation provided in B.2 is inadequate. Barriers are identified in a theoretical manner - it has been almost two years since the decree on non-fired bricks was issued and development on the ground could have been described. Is awareness really a barrier? How much of a barrier? Is technical capacity really a barrier? 80% of the world's production of construction materials are non-fired and the technology is highly mature and widely available. Construction firms in Vietnam have ready and easy access to non-fired brick technology and techniques. To justify an incremental benefit, a clear description of the lack of access to technology would have to be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>described in detail. There is insufficient justification to show that the project components are needed to attract the co-financing from local financial institutions.</p> <p>April 12, 2012. The agency response does a much better job of describing the actual barriers on the ground to meeting the regulatory requirements. The agency has made a strong case in the revised PIF that without the GEF project the industry will not be able to meet the manufacturing levels for non-fired bricks under the regulations. Therefore the demonstrations and financial aid in this project can facilitate efforts beyond the baseline scenario. Comment cleared for the PIF.</p> <p>Please note the statement in the agency response "There are foreign-owned NFB production facilities in the country, but can only produce a small share of the total construction bricks requirement" in box 13 appears to conflict with the agency response in box 11 "Since the market for such products is not yet fully established and features uneven product quality, the sales and consumption of this building material are very poor. Most of the production units only operate at 20-30% of design capacity, with sales reaching only 50-60% of production. As a result, many production units have been forced to stop production." At CEO endorsement</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		we expect additional clarification on issues related to linking existing manufacturers with consumer demand.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012.</p> <p>The project consists of the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy support for non-fired brick (NFB) technology development</li> <li>2. Technical capacity building on NFB technology application and operation</li> <li>3. Sustainable financing support for NFB technology application</li> <li>4. NFB technology application investment and replication</li> </ol> <p>We find significant concerns in the areas described below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There is little justification of the need for components 1 and 2 given the strong baseline scenario in the country.</li> <li>b) Component 3 appears expensive and duplicative of TA portions in component 4</li> <li>c) For component 4, many of the activities listed appear to be TA. All TA and INV activities have to be shown in separate rows in Table B.</li> <li>d) There appears to be duplication of effort between component 3 and component 4.</li> <li>e) The ambition of component 4 is insufficient to justify incrementality. There is no clear justification of the need for small scale demonstrations and feasibility studies. Some news reports indicate that 10% of all construction</li> </ol>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>materials in Vietnam are already non-fired. So the challenge appears to be scale up, not feasibility.</p> <p>f) The timing of the project does not match with national requirements. The three demonstrations are scheduled to be completed by the third year, which will be approximately June 2016, assuming one year of project design. Yet the national requirement for non-fired brick use is already at 20% by 2015, a doubling of production over 2010 levels. There is little justification for demonstrations that will arrive 2-3 years too late.</p> <p>g) There is no explanation of how or why local financial institutions will provide loans for demonstrations.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012.</p> <p>a) The response makes a strong justification for components 1 and 2 given on-the-ground barriers to meeting the Government's NFB requirement.</p> <p>b) The response documents delineates the different between component 3 and the revised investment portion of component 4. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Investment is now shown separately. comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) The response documents how demonstrations are still needed to help manufacturers get on a track to achieve the Government's NFB target. The financial structure is improved. Comment cleared.</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>f) The response documents that manufacturers are ill-prepared to meet the target by the deadline and that the GEF incremental activities will accelerate compliance. Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) This is explained much better. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. No. See box 14. The emissions benefits from the baseline scenario (implementation of the non-fired brick decree) will swamp the demonstration projects. The indirect benefits claimed for the project appear to happen regardless of project outcomes.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The agency has made a strong case in the revised PIF that without the GEF project the industry will not be able to meet the manufacturing levels for non-fired bricks under the regulations. Therefore the demonstrations and financial aid in this project can facilitate efforts beyond the baseline scenario and achieve estimated cumulative GHG emission avoidance of about 4.53 million tons CO2 during the period 2012-2020. Comment 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>DER, January 25, 2012. No.</p> <p>a) Section B.3 claims as socio-economic benefits much of what is required under the baseline scenario (e.g., use of waste ash) and reduced exhaust fumes.</p> <p>b) Sounds like women workers will lose their jobs and be displaced by</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>machinery, even in the baseline scenario. This project says nothing about creating alternative livelihoods for women.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012.  a) The response makes a strong case that the GEF project will bring incremental benefits beyond the baseline. Comment cleared.  b) The response describes some retraining for women and other benefits. Comment cleared.  The response reports that "On the consumption side, utilization of NFBs helps to save up to 4.6 - 6% of the total cost of building construction." This seems to conflict with other statements in the PIF that consumers prefer fired bricks. At CEO endorsement we expect documentation of the top barriers for adoption of NFB.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. Not sufficiently described.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The response provides a better description. Comment cleared. At CEO endorsement we expect a much stronger description of CSO and industry association involvement.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. The major risk not identified is that private sector interests in the construction sector will leapfrog the initiative and make the demonstration projects moot.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The revised PIF</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		more directly addresses the financial needs of manufacturers. Comment cleared.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, January 25, 2012. No. Construction materials is one the fastest growing industrial sectors. 50% of all global production of cement is in China, Vietnam's neighbor. Business associations for construction materials in Thailand, India, and the Philippines are ready sources of know-how and best practices.  DER, April 12, 2012. Explanation was provided. Comment cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, January 25, 2012. Unclear why the Ministry of Science and Technology is the lead when 10% of construction materials in Vietnam are already non-fired brick.  DER, April 12, 2012. Explanation was provided. Comment cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DER, January 25, 2012. The level is fine.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. Not clear. As stated in project design, this project as proposed has a fundamental flaw by emphasizing demonstrations instead of supporting the growing private sector with financial instruments. The GEF investment portion is unclear. The ability of the project to attract local financial institutions is not justified.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The revised PIF more directly addresses the financial needs of manufacturers. The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate. Comment cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. See box 24.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. The revised PIF more directly addresses the financial needs of manufacturers. The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate. Comment cleared. At CEO endorsement we expect confirming co-financing letters and explanation of the revolving loan program.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	DER, January 25, 2012. Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

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>• STAP?</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	DER, January 25, 2012. NA.	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. Not at this time. Under the current form, this PIF is not recommended for further development for reasons specified above.</p> <p>This PIF does not present adequate documentation on the barriers nor justify why the project design will help provide incremental benefits. Instead, the description of the baseline scenarios shows the Government of Vietnam has already made strong policy steps. A more descriptive explanation of the situation on the ground and the barriers faced by the construction materials sector is needed, and would likely call for a different approach that emphasizes the need of industry to scale up rapidly to meet the 2015 deadline. A multi-lateral development bank would have the comparative advantage to implement this different approach. This project is not recommended to proceed unless the approach is changed and an implementing agency with adequate capacities has the lead.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. Not at this time. The PIF has been revised to address the comments. The agency has made a strong case in the revised PIF that without the GEF project the industry</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>will not be able to meet the manufacturing levels for non-fired bricks under the regulations. Therefore the demonstrations and financial aid in this project can facilitate efforts beyond the baseline scenario and deliver incremental benefits. The agency has experience with the type of revolving loan funds being proposed. Comments cleared. However, the revised PIF and the PPG are inconsistent. Please address the PPG comments before the PIF can be cleared.</p> <p>DER, April 13, 2012. Yes. The PPG has been revised to align with the PIF. Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>DER, April 12, 2012.</p> <p>a) At CEO endorsement we expect to see a more clear description of the barriers preventing foreign and domestic owned NFB manufacturers from growing their market, especially if they have an installed base of modern technologies.</p> <p>b) Please note the statement in the agency response "There are foreign-owned NFB production facilities in the country, but can only produce a small share of the total construction bricks requirement" in box 13 appears to conflict with the agency response in box 11 "Since the market for such products is not yet fully established and features uneven product quality, the sales and consumption of this building material are very poor. Most of the production</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>units only operate at 20-30% of design capacity, with sales reaching only 50-60% of production. As a result, many production units have been forced to stop production." At CEO endorsement we expect additional clarification on issues related to linking existing manufacturers with consumer demand.</p> <p>c) We expect a much stronger description of CSO and industry association involvement.</p> <p>d) The response reports that "On the consumption side, utilization of NFBs helps to save up to 4.6 - 6% of the total cost of building construction." This seems to conflict with other statements in the PIF that consumers prefer fired bricks. At CEO endorsement we expect documentation of the top barriers for adoption of NFB.</p> <p>e) At CEO endorsement we expect confirming co-financing letters and explanation of the revolving loan program.</p>	
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*	January 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 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?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. The PPG was reviewed very quickly. As constructed, the activities of the PPG reinforce the conclusion of the PIF review that not enough is understood about the true barriers on the ground to the use of non-fired bricks. If so little is known about the barriers and gaps that the components proposed in this PPG are needed--then it is very possible that the scenario on the ground means there is no need for the project as currently proposed.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. Please see the comments below.</p> <p>a) The start date for the PPG cannot be correct. Please correct.</p> <p>b) The end date for the project design phase is much to late. The goal of the PIF is to provide key demonstrations and financial arrangements to help manufacturers comply with the NGB requirement which has a target in 2014. Please clarify if steps can be taken to conduct the project design much faster. Most of the PPG activities can be performed in parallel such that the elapsed time for completion of all the proposed work could be much less than half of the total time-allotted.</p> <p>c) We see no mention in the PPG components on study of the financial mechanism (i.e., revolving loan program) described in the PIF. Please clarify.</p> <p>d) The GEF is very supportive of the use of local consultants in general over international consultants. However, we are quite surprised by the extensive use of local consultants to perform as experts in activities of the project design even after the PIF claims that expertise on NFB in Vietnam is inadequate. For example one local "NFB Technology Expert" will "Evaluate and verify the level of techno-economic feasibility of further improving the technology of NFB manufacturing in Vietnam; Evaluation of the identified and possibly other potential barriers to NFB technology applications in Vietnam; Evaluation of the potential solutions to the identified barriers; Recommended actions to carry out the barrier removal activities, and the requirements for such actions." Other local consultants are listed as "Technical Experts: (NFB Production; NFB Applications; NFB Market Development; Financing Schemes).</p> <p>Meanwhile, the lone international consultant retained for project design will perform project management and administrative functions such as: "Responsible</p>



		<p>for detailed analysis of cost-effectiveness of the project, facilitation of the LFA, and review of the design of project outcomes and outputs, as well as success indicators and targets, means of verification and assumptions/risks; contribute to drafting &amp; finalization of Project Document."</p> <p>Please reconcile these concerns expressed here with the situation on the ground as described in the PIF and propose a revised PPG. Please clarify why no international consultants on NFB technology are proposed for the project design.</p> <p>e) Consistent with the above comments, we see inadequate coordination with other initiatives in the region and collection/access to technologies for NFB that are widely available.</p> <p>DER, April 13, 2012.  a) The start date has been corrected. Comment cleared.  b) The end date for the project has been accelerated significantly. Comment cleared.  c) Study of the revolving loan program has now been included. Comment cleared.  d) Specific provisions are now included to obtain international best practices.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. See above.</p> <p>April 12, 2012.  a) Eleven weeks for the international consultant to perform the duties as described is too long. Please reduce the costs for this element.  b) The workshop and stakeholder consultations is too costly. Please reduce.</p> <p>DER, April 13, 2012.  a) Shortened. Comment cleared.  b) Workshop cost reduced. Comment cleared.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>DER, January 25, 2012. Not at this time.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2012. Please address comments in box 1 and 2.</p> <p>DER, April 13, 2012. All comments cleared.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 25, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 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.