



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

GEF ID:	5086		
Country/Region:	Thailand		
Project Title:	Achieving Low Carbon Growth in Cities through Sustainable Urban Systems Management in Thailand (LCC)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4778 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3; CCM-4; CCM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,150,000
Co-financing:	\$182,301,010	Total Project Cost:	\$185,551,010
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	Rakshya Thapa

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes, an endorsement letter was signed by OFP Mr. Chote Trachu in the amount of \$3,565,800.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	HT, September 4, 2012: There is no non-grant instrument.	XT, September 8, 2015: No.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes, but please refer to the comment in box 8.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. While only CCM-4 is identified, the project has aspects of CCM-2 (energy efficiency) and CCM-3 (energy recovery from waste).</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: a) CCM-3 has been added as one of its objectives. Please add the consistency of the project with CCM-3 in A.1.1. b) Since CCM-2 is not included in the project objectives, please revise the expected outcomes of Components 1b and 2, like "low-carbon urban systems" or "sustainable urban systems."</p> <p>HT, March 12, 2013: a) Description has been added. Comment cleared. b) Explanation has been provided.</p>	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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?	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. The PIF doesn't refer to the UNFCCC National Communication and the NPFE.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The National Communication and NPFE have been referred. Comment cleared.</p>	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The revised Project Framework includes the development of financial incentive and institutional arrangement to replicate the project outcomes. In this regard, please address the comment in box 14 g).</p> <p>HT, March 12, 2013: Comment cleared.</p>	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
Project Design	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>HT, September 4, 2012: No. Although the PIF lists nine baseline projects, it seems a mere mixture of on-going or planned projects. Moreover, there is no description on how the nine projects are related to each other.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The baseline projects have been reduced to six and the rationale for the selection has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015:</p> <p>1) Baseline projects at the national level do not have a strong linkage with city-level outputs and outcomes. Particularly, all four pilot cities identified waste management as an urban development priority, while TGO's functions have little connection with waste management. Further, the initiatives spearheaded by TGO are more relevant to GHG inventories and carbon markets than to low-carbon urban development.</p> <p>2) Related to comment 1), there is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>no description on national-level transport and waste management activities, while "in particular the sustainable transport and waste management sectors are targeted, as requested by the Thai Government during the GEF5 strategic planning workshops."(page 36 of Project Document)</p> <p>3) Briefly explain why non-registered population is larger than registered population in Khon Kaen (KK). Has KK's Low-Carbon City Plan taken this important factor into consideration?</p> <p>4) In Samui, non-registered population is also much larger than registered population. Please briefly describe the drivers behind this trend and the city's existing measures to house non-registered population.</p> <p>XT, December 15, 2015:</p> <p>1) The explanation on the linkage between TGO and city-level waste management is not convincing. The official TGO website shows its Objectives and Duties as follows: "TGO's Objectives and Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysing and screening the CDM projects for issuance of the Letter of Approval (LoA) and monitoring the projects; • Promoting CDM projects and the CER Market; • To be the National Information Clearing House of Greenhouse Gas; • Management of all information

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>regarding the approved CDM projects and CERs' value;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing the capacity building of the government and private sectors on greenhouse gas management; • Promoting public outreach regarding greenhouse gases; • Promoting and supporting all activities related to climate change mitigation." <p>Comment not cleared.</p> <p>2) Thank you for providing info on national level initiatives related to transport and waste management activities. Please describe the connections between these national level initiatives and the four cities in the project document. Comment not cleared.</p> <p>3) Explanation is helpful. Comment cleared.</p> <p>4) Explanation is helpful. Comment cleared.</p> <p>XT, Feb.17, 2016:</p> <p>1) "Promoting and supporting all activities related to climate change mitigation" doesn't mean that TGO has the authority and capability to implement city-level waste management. Comment not cleared.</p> <p>2) It is not clear how that statements in Para 28, pp 12; Para 38, pp 15; and Para 78-79, pp 28 explain the linkage</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			with the four targeted cities. Comment not cleared.
	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?		XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: No. It is unclear how the GEF financing will deliver global environmental benefits. In addition, the PIF mentions building the capacity of TGO as one of the incremental reasons. Capacity building of executing agencies does not justify a GEF project.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The Project Framework (Table B) has been revised, showing the incremental cost reasoning. A clear link between expected GHG impact and what the GEF is funding should be described in detail at the CEO Endorsement stage, if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015:</p> <p>1) Will those investments in low carbon urban system, such as composting, recycling, waste-to-energy plant, traffic management, anaerobic digestion, and shuttle bus services, not be implemented without GEF funding? Please explain.</p> <p>XT, December 15, 2015: 1) Explanation is helpful. Comment cleared.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: No. The project framework has major problems as follows.</p> <p>a) Please don't change the format of the PIF. For example, the row of sub-total is deleted in Tables A and B. b) The project objective should be more specific. c) The PIF covers a number of different mitigation activities (ex. energy-efficiency building, BRT, waste</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015:</p> <p>Component 1.1: low carbon sustainable urban development planning in selected cities:</p> <p>1) Any kinds of integrated urban planning must link to land-use/zoning policy. Please explain how land-use/zoning regulations play a role in component 1.1. 2) It is unclear how the expected</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>management, green space). Such dispersed nature of activities seems to dilute the efforts.</p> <p>d) It is unclear how the GEF financing will have significant impacts on the on-going or already planned baseline projects.</p> <p>e) There is no clear explanation on what investment activities will be financed by the GEF.</p> <p>f) There is no explanation on linkage between Component 1 and 2.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013:</p> <p>a) The format has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The project objective has been revised. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c-f) The Project Framework (Table B) has been improved, focusing on integrated low carbon development. However, the descriptions of the components (page 9-10) do not reflect the Project Framework. Please revise the descriptions and articulate the project activities in line with the Project Framework.</p> <p>g) Please explain financial incentives and institutional arrangement to replicate low-carbon urban development as specifically as possible. The current description (e.g. CDM PoA, Voluntary Carbon Market Scheme etc.) seems insufficient to replicate the GEF project outcomes successfully in other cities in Thailand. For example, GHG emissions reduction commitments at national and city levels, establishment of funds to</p>	<p>outputs, outputs 1.1.1-1.1.3, will lead to expected outcomes, increased number of Thai cities have formulated and implemented low carbon sustainable urban development plans. The scaling up strategy is not clearly defined.</p> <p>Component 1.2: low carbon investments in selected cities:</p> <p>3) It is not clear how the low-carbon urban planning will guide the investments in output 1.2. The logic connections between output 1.1 and 1.2 are not described.</p> <p>4) Integrated urban planning also means sequencing investments in a way that cities set the correct foundation by addressing the long-lasting and cross-cutting issues first. Please explain if the investment projects in outputs 1.2 serve this purpose.</p> <p>5) Please compare the KK waste management baseline projects (table 4) with the sub-outputs of output 1.2.1 by using a table, and clarify if the added capacity is financed by the GEF financing.</p> <p>6) Please briefly compare the baseline projects with expected output for NR by using a table, and clarify if the increased capacity is financed by the GEF financing.</p> <p>7) For cities of Samui and Klaeng, please also briefly compare the baseline projects and expected outputs</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>support the replication, and identification of buyers in the carbon market would deserve consideration.</p> <p>HT, March 12, 2013: c)-f) The descriptions of the components have been revised in line with the Project Framework. Comment cleared. g) Explanation on financial incentives and institutional arrangement has been provided. These mechanisms for replication of low-carbon urban development should be considered in detail by the CEO Endorsement stage if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>by using a simple table. And clarify if the increased capacity is financed by the GEF financing.</p> <p>Component 2: Financial incentives and institutional arrangement in support of low carbon cities initiatives</p> <p>8) It is not clear how component 2 is linked to the four pilot cities. There is no description on how those cities' proposed low-carbon investments will generate knowledge on financial barriers and others.</p> <p>9) Who are the targeted audiences of the analysis on existing and forthcoming options on financial incentive schemes?</p> <p>10) Many existing training course materials on low-carbon cities are free and available online. There is no need to reinvent the wheels. Please justify why GEF grant is necessary for developing training courses.</p> <p>11) Please explain the relationships between the LCCN and existing city climate initiatives spearheaded by C40, ICLEI and others.</p> <p>12) Please explain why GEF grant is required for the management of LCCN. What is the life expectance of LCCN? Is GEF grant going to cover the personnel costs?</p> <p>XT, December 15, 2015: 1) Info provided. Comment cleared. 2) Info provided. Comment</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>cleared.</p> <p>3) Again, it is not clear how the low-carbon urban planning described in Component 1.1 will guide the investments in Component 1.2. The logic connections between Component 1.1 and 1.2 are not described.</p> <p>4) The original question is targeted at the "investment projects" as described in Component 1.2. Please respond accordingly.</p> <p>5) The project document mixed up the output and baseline scenarios. For example, the sub-outputs (page 48; para 126) session list "construction of a waste-to-energy plant for processing of 450 tonnes of waste per day" as an output, but in the response sheet, this is categorized as a baseline project. Please do clarify what the expected outputs are and what the scenario projects are.</p> <p>6) Same problem with the expected outputs in NR. Please do clarify what the expected outputs are and what the scenario projects are.</p> <p>7) Same problem with the expected outputs in Klaeng and Samui. Please do clarify what the expected outputs are and what the scenario projects are.</p> <p>8) The explanation does not address the issue. Comment not cleared.</p> <p>9) Explanation provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>10) Based on your explanation, GEF funding will be mainly used to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>translate and tailor the existing training course materials instead of developing materials from scratch. Please confirm.</p> <p>11) Explanation provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>12) Please consider linking the LCCN with GEF Sustainable Cities IAP's global knowledge platform, which operates at a global scale. Comment cleared.</p> <p>XT, Feb. 17, 2016:</p> <p>3) Comment cleared.</p> <p>4) Comment cleared.</p> <p>5) Para 126 of pp 48 still mix sub-outputs with baseline project. GEF grant of \$3.15 million is unlikely to deliver an output of "construction of a waste to energy plant for processing of 450 tonnes of waste per day and with an electricity generation capacity of 4.9MW." Comment not cleared.</p> <p>6) Comment not cleared.</p> <p>7) Comment not cleared.</p> <p>8) Explanation is not helpful. Comment not cleared.</p> <p>10) Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: No. The estimated GHG emissions reduction is for the baseline projects, not for GEF financing.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The estimation of GHG emission reduction brought by the GEF funding has been provided. This should be elaborated by the CEO Endorsement</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		stage if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.	
	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?	HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. HT, February 19, 2013: Yes, socio-economic benefits have been described. Comment cleared.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. HT, February 19, 2013: Yes, public participation has been described. Comment cleared.	XT, September 8, 2015: 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)	HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. HT, February 19, 2013: Yes, risks and mitigation measures have been described. Comment cleared.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, September 4, 2012: Not clear. HT, February 19, 2013: The coordination with other related initiatives has been described. Comment cleared.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT, September 4, 2012: No. It is unclear whether the TGO has capacity to execute investment activities. HT, February 19, 2013: The coordination role of TGO has been added. It should be elaborated in detail	XT, September 8, 2015: No. TGO does not have authority over transport and waste management in cities. Please also refer to comments 1-2 in box 11. XT, December 15, 2015:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		by the CEO Endorsement stage how TGO will influence investments in the four cities, if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.	Please refer to comment 1) in box 11 for further clarification. Comment not cleared. XT, Feb. 17, 2016: Comment not cleared. Please refer to comment 1) in box 11.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		XT, September 8, 2015: N/A.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, September 4, 2012: Yes, GEF Project Management Cost (PMC) is 5% of the GEF grant before PMC. HT, February 19, 2013: The PMC has been reduced to \$50,000. Is this true? Please check it. HT, March 12, 2013: The PMC has been revised. Comment cleared.	XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	HT, September 4, 2012: As pointed out in box 14, investment by GEF resources is unclear. If the GEF resources finance only technical assistance, the proposal is overfunded. HT, February 19, 2013: Funding and co-financing per objective have been revised. Please address the following technical comments:	XT, September 8, 2015: It is not clear what exactly will be covered by the GEF financing in component 1.2. Please address comments 5-7 in box 14. XT, December 15, 2015: Clarification is required. Comment not cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a) In Table A, check the GEF funding per objective again as well as PMC. b) In Table B, please check the sub-total and PMC of the GEF funding.</p> <p>HT, March 12, 2013: a) b) The funding and co-financing in Table A have been checked. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, Feb. 17, 2016: Clarification is still required. For more details, see comments 5-7 in box 14.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: Since rationales for the baseline projects are unclear, it is difficult to comment on the indicated co-financing.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: The rationale for the baseline projects has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>HT, September 4, 2012: UNDP is providing \$250,000 as in-kind, which is 0.27 % of the total co-financing. This amount does not reflect its role in the project.</p> <p>HT, February 19, 2013: While co-financing (grant) from UNDP has been added, co-financing (in-kind) from UNDP has been removed, leading to decrease of UNDP co-financing. Is that true? If that is the case, please reconsider.</p> <p>HT, March 12, 2013: The co-financing (in-grant) from the UNDP has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		XT, September 8, 2015: 1) The response to US comment - the proposal does not address how the waste management projects will be managed - is not adequate. In particular, the feasibility studies and socialization facilitation are not considered as project management. XT, December 15, 2015: Comment cleared.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	HT, October 18, 2012: No. The project requires significant redesign. Please contact the GEF secretariat before submitting a revised proposal. HT, February 19, 2013: The PIF has been improved. Please address the comments in box 8, 14, 23, 24 and 26. HT, March 12, 2013: All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	HT, March 12, 2013: Please address the following items by the CEO Endorsement stage: a) detailed approach to reflect the city plans (Component 1a) into investment (Component 1b); b) substance of financial incentives and institutional arrangement for replication; c) estimation of GHG emissions reduction and its link with GEF funding; d) detailed project implementation/ execution arrangement, including the TGO's role to influence investment for low-carbon urban development.	
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?		XT, September 8, 2015: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes 11, 13, 14, 20, 24, and 29.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 04, 2012	September 8, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 19, 2013	December 15, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 12, 2013	February 17, 2016: Not at this time. Please address comments in box 11, 14, 20, and 24.
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	HT, October 18, 2012: Please redesign the PPG request with the PIF.
	4. Other comments	HT, March 12, 2013: Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.