

Zero Carbon Buildings for All: from Energy Efficiency to Decarbonization

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10321

Countries

Global

Project Name

Zero Carbon Buildings for All: from Energy Efficiency to Decarbonization

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

8/31/2020

Review completed by PM

1/11/2021

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

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

This item is cleared.

Yes.

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

This item is cleared.

PM review after resubmission: Jan 11, 2021

PPO comments: 17 Dec 2020:

1. Expected Implementation Start need to be adjusted to a more realistic date

Submission Date 8/28/2020	Expected Implementation Start 11/1/2020	Expected Completion Date 10/31/2022
Duration 24		Agency Fee(\$) 190,000.00
Submission Date 8/28/2020	Expected Implementation Start 11/1/2020	Expected Completion Date 10/31/2022
Duration 24		Agency Fee(\$) 190,000.00

2. Co-financing from IFC should be labeled as ?Donor Agency? as source (part of the WBG) instead of ?Others?

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Others	International Finance Corporation	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,472,760.00	
Private Sector	Johnson Controls	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00	

This item is cleared (PM review).

Review round 12/08/20:

All previous comments were addressed by the agency.

Comments 09/22/20.

The project structure and design are appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes, in line with the approved PIF. However, please note the comments below:

Project Budget: in line with the revised GEF Project Cycle Guidelines, please note the following requirements which are applicable to all first submissions of PIFs/CEO ERs from July 20th, 2020:.

A) General remarks:

1. Budgets provided by Agencies should show clear distinction between: i) PMC activities, ii) monitoring and evaluation activities, iii) project budget activities, and iv) which entity makes use of GEF financing to undertake them.

2. An indicative template is included in the Updated Guidelines - once completed, the Agency needs to submit it at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. Note that Agencies received an excel format for them to carry out their calculations accurately - the final version of the excel format needs to be uploaded in the section ?Documents? in Portal. If the excel version is not uploaded, we cannot follow the calculations, reason why the project needs to be returned.

B) Additional guidance to prepare the budget:

1. the budget should include indication of the co-financing to each budget line.
2. total project financing amount of the budget table matches with totals of table A, B, and D.
3. sub-totals of components match with corresponding components in table B, including PMC and M&E.
4. sub-total of M&E matches with the M&E budget in the Portal and in the Project Document, as well as it is within the recommended threshold as specified in the Guidelines (5% of the GEF-funded part of project financing for projects up to USD 5 mil).
5. PMC are within the threshold or 5% of GEF project financing and there should be ?proportionality? between PMC covered by the GEF funding vs co-financing.
6. costs associated with the execution of the project are covered by the GEF portion *and* the co-financing portion of the PMC.
7. Project staff costs (e.g. Project Director/Manager, Coordinator, any admin/procurement staff, etc.) should be covered with PMC until reaching the allowable threshold (5% for GEF and a proportional amount from co-financing), and only after can be charged to project components other than PMC. In this case there should be a clear link (in the case of good or services) or Terms of Reference (in the case of project staff) describing unique outputs/deliverables linked to the respective components as opposed to general project execution.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

Project budget:

UNEP understands, based on discussions between UNEP's GEF Coordinator and the GEF's Director of Strategy and Operations, that projects that had previously negotiated their budgets with executing agencies and partners and had already undergone internal quality assurance processes, would not be required to change the budget template at this point. Moreover, UNEP prefers to continue using its budget template for project implementation to be aligned with its management informatic system (UMOJA). However, we understand the GEF aim of budget standardization to facilitate its review and we have added an additional budget using the GEF template format in the CEO Endorsement request as well.

A) With regards to the general remarks:

1. The budget provided in the CEO Endorsement Document and uploaded on the Portal shows a clear distinction between Project Management costs, Monitoring & Evaluation

costs, substantive project Components costs and an extra column showing which entity makes use of the GEF funds.

Note: WRI will be making use of the entire GEF grant for this project, with the exception of the budget planned for the Mid-Term Evaluation and the Terminal Evaluation (US\$ 30,000) that will be used by the UNEP Evaluation Office.

2. Please refer to our response above on the project budget. The excel version of the project budget has been uploaded on the 'Documents' section of the Portal.

B) With regards to the additional guidance:

- 1) There was agreement from the GEF following these comments that the co-financing budget was sufficient as it currently has been submitted.
- 2) Tables A, B, and D match the total project financing amount of the budget table.
- 3) Sub-totals of components match the corresponding components in Table B.
- 4) The sub-total of M&E matches the description in the project document (Part II, Section 10).
- 5) PMC is within 10% of the project financing (the limit for a MSP) and it is proportional for GEF grant and cofinance.
- 6) Costs associated with project execution are covered by both the GEF costs and WRI co-financing for the PMC.
- 7) Project staff costs are now covered in PMC up to nearly the 10% threshold, and then in project components. Terms of Reference for project staff describing unique outputs/deliverables are provided in Annex H with clear linkages to project components.

22 December, 2020 Responses to PPO comment:

1. Expected Implementation Start has been adjusted to 1 February 2021.
2. Co-financing label for IFC has been changed to 'Donor Agency' as source (part of the WBG) instead of 'Others'.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

This item is cleared.

yes, all organizations expected to provide co-financing volumes have submitted written confirmation letters.

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
This item is cleared.

Yes, the financing presented in Table D is consistent with what presented in the PIF.

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 N/A - no PPG was requested for this MSP.

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
This item is cleared.

The changes in the core indicators targets presented in Table E are reasonable, and attributable to the fact that the expected GHG reduction impacts are now calculated with respect to the two specific countries that have been selected.

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

This item is cleared.

Yes, this is consistent with the PIF, as approved.

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/20/2020:

Yes, the elaboration of the baseline is provided and in line with what approved at PIF level. However, the information included in relation to Colombia and Turkey in the section titled "Zero Carbon Buildings for All: increasing ambition to meet global goals" is insufficient to draw a clear picture of the baseline for the two countries and associated cities which have been selected for the project's deep dive engagements.

Please consider and address the comments below with appropriate information in the CEO ER:

1. Clearly outline what was done, in detail, in both countries, at both national and local level, including activities implemented and results obtained (reasonably attributable to the project), including an estimation of the investments that have leveraged by the policy dialogue, technical support and regulatory work. (Existing baseline)
2. Clearly elaborate a narrative describing the prospective and dynamic results to be reasonably expected in the near/medium term as a consequence of the existing BEA activities in the two countries and relative cities, versus what would have happened without the existing activities (Dynamic/projected baseline).
3. with respect to Turkey, the section titled "Zero Carbon Buildings for All: increasing ambition to meet global goals" mentions that the with support of GIZ "the national Government is developing roadmaps towards nearly zero-energy building":

3.a. Please clarify how this initiative relates to the GEF/UNEP/WRI project and what are any overlap to be avoided/synergies to be maximized.

3.b. Also, it should be cleared which activities should already be considered in the baseline, and not as part of the project.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

1. 1. We have elaborated as requested on the in-country existing baseline, results, and leveraged investments in *Part II, Section 1b ?Project Description?, Subsection 2 ?Baseline scenario?*, in a new subtitled section *?National Snapshots: Turkey and Colombia?* (p 20-22).
2. 2. We have elaborated as requested on the dynamic/projected baseline, and impact of activities thus far. This can be found in *Part II, Section 1b ?Project Description?, Subsection 2 ?Baseline scenario?*, in a new subtitled section *?National Snapshots: Turkey and Colombia?* (p 20-22). As outlined in the CEO Endorsement Document, deep engagement cities will be selected during month 1 of the project. 2-3 of the 4 selected cities are expected to be continuing cities from previous BEA projects, so we have included information about local action in BEA cities in Colombia and Turkey. We have also included an accounting of the completed in-country activities that should be considered part of the project baseline.
3. 3. With respect to the Turkey national roadmap to nearly-zero energy buildings (NZEBs), being developed with support from GIZ,
 - a. We have clarified that it will be a key input to a roadmap for decarbonizing buildings (please refer to the National snapshots section, p. 21). NZEB roadmaps tend to focus on the operational phase of a building, whereas building decarbonization can also include embodied carbon in the construction phase (such as the carbon intensity of building materials).
 - b. We have elaborated to explain that decarbonizing buildings includes consideration of decarbonizing the energy buildings will use (through electrification and/or clean energy, including offsite procurement of clean energy), storage, urban planning, and other elements that likely to go beyond an NZEB roadmap. Please refer to the National snapshots section as well (p.21).

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/20/2020:

1. Component 1: in the section relative to the selection of the two countries, it is mentioned that Colombia and Turkey are "recommended". This should be corrected to "selected" since the letters of non objections have been obtained. OK
2. Component 2: It is unclear whether the deep dive cities have been selected or not. At CEO ER stage, the project location should be clarified, and the baselines and projected activities for each city should be clearly outlined. The document mentions that cities *will* be selected (see under component 2 for instance), but in several sections it seems to assume that 3 cities in Colombia and one in Turkey - all of which existing BEA cities - will be selected. The project map signals that the cities would have already been selected. This is confusing and should be clarified. OK
3. The section describing the city selection process should include a timeline and an indication of any steps needed to complete the selection, and any implications on this additional time needed on the project implementation schedule. OK
4. Output 2.1 refers to a total of 4 cities, 2 for each selected country. However, this is contradicted in other parts of the document. Needs clarification. Also, if only one city is selected in Turkey, there needs to be explanation on why and how this is going to affect the feedback loop between national and sub-national actors which the project's theory of change is built on. OK
5. Output 2.4: This is vague: what does "innovative methods for monitoring process" mean in this context. Also, why would this only be applied in 2 of the 4 cities? OK
6. Output 2.5: More progress would have been expected on this after more than 1 year of project design (from PIF approval). This remains a weak point of this project and needs strengthening/more attention. The language remains exactly the same as in the PIF - what was done to further engage financial institutions to ensure their active participation to the project and to build the foundations for their possible financial participation in the ZCB sector in the two countries? OK

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

1. Component 1: Colombia and Turkey are now indicated to have been selected, rather than recommended (p 28).

2. Component 2: This has been modified to clarify that deep dive cities will be selected by the end of the first month of project implementation (p 31). The project map has been edited to only show the selected countries to reduce confusion (p 43 and Annex E).

3. The section describing the city selection process has been modified to indicate that the selection will be made in the first month of the project (p 31). This will not add any time to the implementation schedule and is also noted in the Project Timeline (p 36-37) at the end of the *Alternative Scenario* section.

4. As indicated in Output 2.1, there will be a total of 4 cities, 2 for each selected country. Points in the document which reference other numbers of cities and which may be causing confusion fall into two categories: (1) references to *existing BEA cities in selected countries*, or (b) *project outputs which target 3 of 4 deep dive cities to achieve a particular milestone*. The latter is because we do not expect all four selected deep engagements to make equal progress throughout the project timeline, and certain more ambitious outputs aim to be achieved in 3 cities within the time frame rather than all four.

5. Output 2.4: The methods for monitoring progress are not pre-defined: they will be co-created with cities and national governments, and developed by multi-stakeholder working groups that also bring in global expertise, to be appropriate for the local context. The specific topic(s) for monitoring and the specific context will depend on the cities selected. However, examples of potential innovative monitoring methods might be involving the public or using big data or unusual data collection methods.

This is being assumed to be applied in 2 of the 4 deep engagement cities to account for different rates of progress in different cities ? within a 2 year timeframe, we do not expect that all 4 cities will advance at the same pace or to the same degree, and therefore we do not expect that all 4 cities would be able to achieve this within the 2 year timeframe of the project given that the development of a monitoring mechanism for the progress against targets would be carried out after definition of -- and the start of implementation of ? those targets and associated action plans.

6. Output 2.5: We have added more country-specific information under Output 2.5 in the *Proposed alternative scenario?* section (p 33-34) on high-level global opportunities as well as specific information from Colombia and Turkey that reflects engagement of financial institutions and reflect pathways for their participation in the ZCB sector and in the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Yes, this is well aligned with the GEF CCM focal area, especially regarding Objective 1, and entry point 3: Accelerating energy efficiency adoption (CCM-1-3).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/20/2020:

- As discussed above in this review sheet, the incremental reasoning with respect to the existing BEA activities in the cities and countries selected needs strengthening. Please refer to the more specific comments above.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

We have elaborated as requested on the in-country existing baseline, dynamic/projected baseline, and impact of activities thus far. This can be found in *Part II, Section 1b ?Project Description?, Subsection 2 ?Baseline scenario?*, in a new subtitled section *?National Snapshots: Turkey and Colombia? (p 20-22)* as well as in *Part II, Section 5) Incremental / additional cost reasoning (p 38)*.

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/21/2020:

The project's contribution in terms of global environmental benefits is sufficiently elaborated. However, please consider the comment below:

1. Please elaborate on whether the risk of double counting emission reductions impacts at national level and at city level have been taken into account. in other words, please clarify that positive GHG reduction results at city level are discounted from the overall results at national level (i.e. city results are not counted twice).

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

City level actions intentionally provide additional emissions reductions on top of the national emissions reductions, so these are not double counted. Component 1 counts savings from national plans and policies and are estimated using only half of the urban area of each country ? this latter ensuring that double counting will not occur. Components 2 & 3 count savings from city plans, programs and policy ? leading to better implementation of national policies and/or implementation of additional policies.

We have further elaborated on the methodology and specific savings from the national and local levels in Section 6) Global environmental benefits (p 40).

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

This item is cleared.

Yes, this section is satisfactory and consistent with the PIF, as approved.

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

This item is cleared.

Yes, this is consistent with the PIF, as approved.

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

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

This item is cleared.

Yes, this section is well developed.

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

This item is cleared.

Review from PM: Jan, 11 2021.

Comment from PPO: Dec 17, 2020:

While, the CEO Endorsement includes a sound gender action plan, there is little evidence that UNEP has carried out any additional gender analyses to inform the project design. The GEF Policy on Gender Equality, requires that (at or prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval) Agencies provide ? Gender Analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment that identifies and describes any gender differences, gender differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to address gender gaps and promote the empowerment of women that may be relevant to the proposed activity. While it could be understandable that there might have been some challenges for UNEP to carry

out an in-depth gender analysis during the PPG phase due to Covid or other issues, this is not described. Please provide further information on any analysis conducted or provide a detailed justification of the reason why a gender analysis has not been carried out at this stage including elaboration on any planned efforts to better understand gender dimensions to support gender responsive implementation of the project.

Agency Response

24 December, 2020 Responses to PPO comment:

Information has been added on the gender section. It indicates how the analysis was carried out at the PIF stage, which informed the design, and how without a project preparation grant (PPG) and with limited ability to conduct on-the-ground research due to COVID-19, minimal additional analysis has been carried out for this project during the CEO Endorsement request development. Primarily, this is due to two factors: (1) there is limited understanding of building decarbonization-gender equity linkages globally, and (2) the short time frame of this project, which will allow us to demonstrate impact on direct beneficiaries and participants but not to measure the long-term impacts to construction industry gender equity resulting from the inclusive stakeholder processes that will feed into the national roadmaps.

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

This item is cleared.

Yes, engagement with the private sector have been adequately outlined. Additional engagement with private sector, including as prospective co-financiers is expected to be developed during project implementation and documented through PIRs and other monitoring tools.

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/21/2020:

the risk section is well developed. However, please consider the guidance recently issued by GEF Secretariat for agencies regarding COVI-19:

"Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics", of August 27, 2020.

There is an opportunity to use this project to further promote energy efficiency in the building sector in the selected geographies, and including through full building decarbonization, as a tool to relaunch economies after the covid-related slowdown and create jobs. IEA analysis has suggested that EE is one of the best sectors to link global environmental benefits with economic recovery.

1. In line with the new Guidance from the GEF, projects should clearly highlight both risks and opportunities in response to the COVID crisis. We suggest creating a new section related to this, covering both risks (risks can also remain included in the risk section) and opportunities and including some indication of how the project will work through its international and local (human) resources to ensure that building efficiency and building decarbonization remain high on the priorities of the beneficiary governments and appropriate support can be provided as technical inputs in the respective recovery plans.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

1. Deeper assessment of the risks and opportunities associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and associated economic upheaval has been added in *Part II, Section 5: Risks* below the Risks table (p 66-68).

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/21/2020:

1. Approximately 50% of the total GEF resources are proposed to be disbursed locally through subgrants. This execution arrangement is not sufficiently detailed in the project institutional arrangements. More information and detail is needed to explain the expected mechanism to channel resources via such sub-grants, including, in particular, how the execution of such subgrants will be supervised to ensure continued compliance with the GEF minimum fiduciary standards.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

Explanation has been added with respect to subgrant and contracting mechanisms in Part II, Section 6: Institutional Arrangement and Coordination (p 68).

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

This item is cleared.

Consistency with national priorities, including their NDCs, is adequately outlined.

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

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020

Comments 09/21/2020:

1. Please provide a detailed budget by output, including activity and sub-activity, so that it can be clearly understood and documented what is the budget that is set aside for knowledge management products and services. The budget as provided does not allow this analysis.

2. While the section includes mention of expected knowledge products/outputs that will be generated, it is not clear which products have been budgeted for. Please ensure there is clear indication of what is budgeted, and how that is linked to the products/outputs listed in the project workplan and deliverables (by output).

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

More detail has been provided in Part II, Section 8: Knowledge Management to indicate specific deliverables, timelines from the work plan, as well as expected reference to budget lines and allocation by Component (p 71-72).

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

This item is cleared.

Environmental and social risks and impacts are adequately assessed and documented in the project's ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REVIEW NOTE (ESERN), included in Annex P to the CEO ER.

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

This item is cleared.

PM Review: Jan 11th, 2021 (after resubmission).

Additional Comments from PPO Dec 17, 2020:

1. M&E Plan must be included in both ?Portal and Project Document.
2. The cost relative to the Project Manager is partially allocated to components, as well as to PMC, however the TOR only reflect coordination activities. Please include in the TOR the contribution of this position to the specific components to which her/his salary is charged.

Project Manager (PM)	<p>The PM will be hosted within the World Resources Institute premises and have the following duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take responsibility for day-to-day project operations; • Take responsibility for the execution of the project in accordance with the project objectives, activities and budget; • Deliver the outputs and demonstrate its best efforts in achieving the project outcomes; • Coordinate project execution and liaison with national counterparts (relevant ministries, national agencies, private sector, NGOs etc.); • Manage financial resources and processing all financial transaction relating to sub-allotments; • Prepare all annual/year-end project revisions; • Attend and facilitate inception workshops and national project steering committee meetings; 	<p>Regular meetings with the PD, at least twice per month</p> <p>Quarterly meeting with the project's Financial Officer</p> <p>Ad-hoc meetings with project team members</p>
----------------------	---	--

sement November 8 2020

129

Composition	Role and description	Frequency of meetings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess project risks in the field, monitor risk management plan; • Ensure technical quality of products, outputs and deliverables; • Coordinate the project team of consultants and subcontractors; • Coordinate with strategic taskforces (i.e. thematic or technical working groups); • Act as Secretary of the PSC; • Plan and organize the PSC annual meetings; • Periodic reporting to UNEP and the PSC for allocation of the GEF grant according to the approved workplan and budget, in coordination with UNEP and PD; • Notify UNEP and the PSC in writing if there is need for modification to the agreed implementation plan and budget, and to seek approval; • Address and rectify any issues or inconsistencies raised by the Implementing Agency; • Support compilation and submission of progress, financial and audit reporting to the Implementing Agency; • Prepare, at the end of the project, the project Final Report. 	<p>(consultants, subcontractors, etc.)</p>

Project Manager (PM)	<p>The PM will be hosted within the World Resources Institute premises and have the following duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take responsibility for day-to-day project operations; • Take responsibility for the execution of the project in accordance with the project objectives, activities and budget; • Deliver the outputs and demonstrate its best efforts in achieving the project outcomes; • Coordinate project execution and liaison with national counterparts (relevant ministries, national agencies, private sector, NGOs etc.); • Manage financial resources and processing all financial transaction relating to sub-allotments; • Prepare all annual/year-end project revisions; • Attend and facilitate inception workshops and national project steering committee meetings; 	<p>Regular meetings with the PD, at least twice per month</p> <p>Quarterly meeting with the project's Financial Officer</p> <p>Ad-hoc meetings with project team members</p>
----------------------	---	--

September 8 2020

129

Composition	Role and description	Frequency of meetings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess project risks in the field, monitor risk management plan; • Ensure technical quality of products, outputs and deliverables; • Coordinate the project team of consultants and subcontractors; • Coordinate with strategic taskforces (i.e. thematic or technical working groups); • Act as Secretary of the PSC; • Plan and organize the PSC annual meetings; • Periodic reporting to UNEP and the PSC for allocation of the GEF grant according to the approved workplan and budget, in coordination with UNEP and PD; • Notify UNEP and the PSC in writing if there is need for modification to the agreed implementation plan and budget, and to seek approval; • Address and rectify any issues or inconsistencies raised by the Implementing Agency; • Support compilation and submission of progress, financial and audit reporting to the Implementing Agency; • Prepare, at the end of the project, the project Final Report. 	<p>(consultants, subcontractors, etc.)</p>

Agency Response

24 December, 2020 Responses to PPO comment:

1. The M&E table has been added in the Portal Section 9. Monitoring and Evaluation, and it is also in the UNEP Project Document Package (Annex J M&E Budget and Workplan).
2. The PM list of activities in the Institutional Arrangements (Annex K) has been revised to include both the coordination activities and technical responsibilities of this project manager role. Please refer also to the detailed Terms of References in Annex H of the UNEP Project Document Package. In addition to managerial tasks, the Project Manager will be responsible for the following technical deliverables:

1.1.3 Public commitment from Colombia and Turkey national governments on net zero carbon buildings

2.5.1 Stakeholder working group on business models for investing in ZCBs, including development banks and private sector stakeholders, is convened at least twice during project period

3.1.3 Lessons learned publication stemming from national and deep dive city engagements

3.2.2 6 or more additional subnational governments make public commitments toward zero carbon buildings

3.3.1 Written guidance developed for scope and process for city or subnational government roadmaps to ZCBs

3.3.2 3 or more additional subnational governments develop and begin implementation of ZCB roadmaps

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

This item is cleared.

The project's socio economic benefits are spelled out in the corresponding section of the CER ER.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020: the revised budget was submitted to the document section of the portal.

Comments 09/21/2020

1. the project budget needs to be prepared according to the new GEF Project Cycle guidance, and uploaded on the portal.

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

1. As mentioned earlier, based on discussions between UNEP's GEF Coordinator and the GEF's Director of Strategy and Operations, UNEP understands that projects that had previously negotiated their budgets with executing agencies and partners and had already undergone internal quality assurance processes, would not be required to change the budget template at this point. However, the project includes now the budget in two formats to comply with UNEP and GEF templates.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared:

review: 12/08/2020:

Comments 09/21/2020

1. Project Result Framework: The PRF falls short of including key expected project outputs indicators. It does not mention the minimum number of policies (in broad sense, from MEPs, to certifications, to legislative acts that support, enable or require increased energy efficiency) that are expected to be supported in the design phase, adopted, and implemented. "# of policy developed" and "# of policies for which adoption is initiated" are key indicators and should be included in the PRF (outputs: 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 3.3).

Agency Response

26 November, 2020:

1. While the project results framework focuses on outcome-level indicators, the "Alternative scenario" section of the CEO Endorsement Document and the Workplan (Annex L) include a detailed list of project deliverables that serve as output-level indicators. The Workplan even provides information on the timeline for each deliverable:

- Under Output 1.3, Deliverable 1.3.4 is formulated as follows: "National roadmap adoption is initiated in Colombia and Turkey", meaning that a total of 2 national roadmaps (1 per country) will have their adoption initiated by month 22 of the project's implementation.
- Under Output 1.4, Deliverable 1.4.3 is formulated as follows: "Adoption of selected policies is initiated in Colombia and Turkey", meaning that a total of 2 national policies (1 per country) will have their adoption initiated by month 24 of the project's implementation.

- Under Output 2.3, Deliverable 2.3.3 is formulated as follows: "Adoption of selected policies is initiated in at least 3 cities in Colombia and Turkey.", meaning that a total of 3 city policies will have their adoption initiated by month 22 of the project's implementation.

- Under Output 3.3, Deliverable 3.3.2 is formulated as follows: "3 or more additional subnational governments develop and begin implementation of ZCB roadmaps", meaning that at least 3 cities/subnational governments will have developed and started the implementation of their ZCB roadmaps by month 24 of the project's implementation.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Included in the CEO ER.

Agency Response
Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/20:

The CEO ER is being recommended for technical clearance after clearance of PPO comments.

12/08/20:

The CEO ER is being recommended for technical clearance.

09/21/2020:

The Agency is requested to address the comments in this review sheet and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/21/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/8/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/17/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/11/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The building sector is a major contributor to global warming. Buildings account for 36% of global final energy use and nearly 40% of energy related of greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, the buildings sector presents perhaps the world's most cost-effective climate mitigation opportunity, through a combination of efficiency and on- or off-site renewable energy generation. This project builds on the work initiated by the GEF-financed global Building Efficiency Accelerator (BEA) network, and will scale up the existing BEA baseline interventions in Turkey and Colombia, two of the countries with significant climate mitigation potential in this sector. Component 1 will work with the two countries' national governments to prepare them to adopt building sector programs and policies that support accelerated city action on building efficiency.

Component 2 will work in four "deep dive" cities in the two countries, to match expertise, demand to decarbonize the building sector, and opportunities to access new transaction paths and financing. Finally, through component 3 the project will aim at further generating pipelines of additional local and national governments for future scaling through platform-wide capacity building and technical assistance. The project is expected to generate cumulative emissions (direct and indirect) in excess of 7 million tons of CO₂e, and to benefit directly approximately 1,000 people.

In relation to COVID19, this program is squarely centered around key elements of the green recovery concept. The International Energy Agency suggested that energy efficiency is one of the best sectors to link global environmental benefits with economic recovery and sustainable job creation. By advancing the agenda and policy pathways for zero-carbon infrastructures, this program will contribute to showcase how public and private sector intervention in energy efficiency can effectively support a restart of local and national economies. In terms of risks, lockdown measures will pose challenges to the implementation of some of the in-country project activities. However, both UNEP, WRI and their local executing partners have shown to be able to adapt to remote program management, stakeholder interactions and training, for which further capacity will be installed in the project management unit.