

Enhancing the Energy Management System to Scale up Energy Efficiency Investments in Public Buildings in Serbia

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10443

Countries

Serbia

Project Name

Enhancing the Energy Management System to Scale up Energy Efficiency Investments in Public Buildings in Serbia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/17/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Ming Yang

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, the project remains aligned with the GEF CCM focal area elements as presented in PIF.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Component 1 is very important, but the GEF budget (\$800,000) is too high. Please consider allocating part of the budget to Component 2 for tangible asset investments.

Outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 are all related to technical assistant activities, although they are called as INV. Please use majority of the GEF funding to show case the effectiveness of new policies, new laws, new regulations, the newly established EMIS help desk, the skills of the trained energy managers, and new energy efficient technologies. In other words, please select several public buildings such as government office buildings, national public libraries, public hospitals or public schools to do energy efficiency retrofitting or renovation. These buildings can be from the 28 pre- selected central government buildings, or from other newly selected buildings if the budget for the pre-sectioned 28 buildings are finished. Please use considerable GEF funding for capital investments in such renovation.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?


Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

The loan agreements of the "CEB", "CEB SIGA and SCA Trust Funds, and "European Western Balkans Joint Fund" cannot be used as co-financing letters. Please ask these agency to issue standard co-financing letters. The UNDP co-financing letter is standardized. Please use it as a template.

For the co-financing letter that was signed by Professor Zorana Z. Mihajlovic. Please ask the Ministry of Mining and Energy to issue a letter showing that Professor Mihajlovic has capacity to represent the Ministry of Mining and Energy for signing the letter.



Professor Zorana Z. Mihajlović, PhD

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/17/2021 MY:

Yes. The GEF financing resource presented in Table D is adequate and it will be cost-effective to meet the project objectives, if the project is further revised per the GEF comments.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/17/2021 MY:

Yes. Annex C is presented on page 72.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

There is no change from the PIF to the CEO AR on core indicators and the targeted GEBs (See page 15).

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time. Although the project design has remained essentially the same as already presented in the PIF, it is necessary to update the key issues including the root causes and barriers in the CEO AR document.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Although the baseline is the same as in the PIF, it is necessary to update the baseline in the CEO AR package.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Although the alternative scenario is the same as in the PIF, it is necessary to update it in the CEO AR package.

As commented above, please use some of GEF funding for asset investments in component 2.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

There is not any further elaboration, but it is OK because the project design is not changed.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Please further elaborate the baseline, incremental reasoning and GEF contribution on the top of the PIF.

Please clearly elaborate the co-financing. Please see comments in the box that is related to co-financing.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not yet.

The Agency claimed to have used GEF's "Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Accounting and Reporting for GEF Projects" to estimate the GEBs for this project. The Agency indicated that the data and calculation on GHG reduction are presented in Annex 13. But Annex 13 is missing in the GEF Portal. Please clearly indicate where the Annex 13 is or resubmit it.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not yet.

Please further and better elaborate project innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

In Annex D, please mark the project sites on the map, and justify that the project will not overlap any territory of the neighboring countries of Serbia.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

In the CEO AR document, one cannot find a detailed report on stakeholder engagement. Please clearly indicate where to find the report.

The CEO AR document indicates that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan with a time table is attached to the project document as Annex 9 and has been uploaded with the submission as a separate document. In the GEF Portal, one cannot find Annex 9. Please resubmit it or clearly indicate where it is.

In the report, please make sure to include information on stakeholders to be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information on stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, the gender analysis has been completed. Annex 11 (pages 26 - 29 of the CEO AR document presents the results.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time. On page 36, the CEO AR shows the following paragraph on private sector engagement:

The private sector will have a key role in implementing the project ? primarily as a service provider for developing new features and functionalities for EMIS data management as well as for different elements of the actual building renovation, including energy audits, technical and financial feasibility analysis, actual construction work and monitoring of the results of the work done. Besides, the private sector (e.g. private banks) will have a role in providing project financing, managing the credit lines of international multilateral financing institutions and offering new type of financing instruments and modalities such as ESCO financing.

The above statement is too general. Please indicate the roles as a financier and/or as a stakeholder and elaborate how they will contribute to each of the expected outputs of the project.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time. Please undertake more detailed analysis on risks that are likely from COVID-19 and climate change. Please also show theory of change for the project.

1. COVID-19

Please brief the measures to cope with COVID-19 by responding the following three questions:

1.1 General: Describe briefly how the pandemic overall is addressed in the project, including associated impacts, risks and opportunities. Projects are required to identify and establish likely impacts and risks from COVID-19, and how they will be dealt with in the context of delivering global environment benefits and climate adaptation and resilience benefits.

1.2 Risk analysis: Please consider any risks and measures to deal with the risks that are caused by COVID-19 and post-COVID-19. These risks include (1) availability of Technical Expertise and Capacity and Changes in Timelines in the selected provinces; and (2) any expected financing from the government and co-financing from all stakeholders. Please describe further how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated into the design of this project. The project is expected to include consideration to the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project implementation.

1.3 Opportunity analysis: Describe further how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts (if any) created by COVID-19 to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits and contribute toward green recovery and building back the economy.

2. Climate Risk Screening

Please do more analysis on Climate Risk Screening. Specifically, please double check to ensure that climate risks are identified, listed and described per the guidance of STAP. See <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

This includes but not limited to:

2.1. Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations, which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc.).

2.2. Showing risks with a time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050).

2.3. Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above. This means elaborating a narrative that describes how the climate scenarios indicated above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050.

2.4. Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and climate risk mitigation measures during PPG. The STAP guidance shows more details on it.

3. Theory of Change

From October 2020 onwards, the GEF started to use revised review criteria with higher standards. To meet the standard, the agency needs to address more issues that are related to the project such as Theory of Change.

Referring to STAP's primer on the issue of Theory of Change (TOC) - <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer> , Please draw a chart to demonstrate TOC for this project and write a couple of paragraphs to explain the TOC.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please:

1. use a diagram (chart) to show the roles of all project stakeholders with coordination relationship or links;
2. indicate any other GEF financed projects that are relevant to this project.
3. elaborate coordination between this project and any other bilateral or multilateral agencies financed projects in the project area.
4. elaborate how the private sector contributions to the project will be coordinated.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, it is shown on page 40 under the section title of "7. Consistency with National Priorities."

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

Please elaborate the "?Knowledge Management Approach" with a timeline, milestones and deliverables.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, the Social and Environmental Screening (with the 2021 SESP Template) is presented on pages 45-68.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

In the section of monitoring and evaluation, the Agency indicates the following: "The Monitoring Plan included in Annex 5 of the project document details the roles, responsibilities, and frequency of monitoring project results." But Annex 5 is missing in the GEF Portal. Please clearly indicate where Annex 5 is or resubmit it.

Please make sure the M&E plan includes indicators and targets and measures to monitor them.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please use quantitative information/data to show the social and economic benefits.

Please elaborate how these benefits translate in supporting the achievements of GEBs of this project.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Annexes numbers and attachments are in mess. Please use one Annex system such as Annex A, Annex B; or Annex 1, Annex 2, etc. or Annex A; Annex A1, Annex A2, Annex B1; Annex B2, etc. to present annexes. Please do not use both systems in one document. Please put all Annexes in one document if possible and upload it onto the GEF Portal.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on page 69.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, the GEF SEC's comments in the PIF stage have been addressed on page 72.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Yes, it is shown on page 72, Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not completed. A map is shown on page 73. But please mark the project sites on the map.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/17/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Please address the above comments.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**