



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9496		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Leapfrogging Chilean's Markets to more Efficient Refrigerator and Freezers		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$40,000	Project Grant:	\$1,473,762
Co-financing:	\$7,411,551	Total Project Cost:	\$8,925,313
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Ruth Coutto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with CCM-1, Program 1: Promote the timely development, demonstration and financing of low-carbon technologies and mitigation options.	
	2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with Chile's key energy policies and initiatives, including Energy 2050, the Energy Efficiency Act (in	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	under relevant conventions?	process), the recently passed Extended Producer Responsibility Act, the existing energy efficiency labeling and Minimum Efficiency Performance Standards.	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Please see below.</p> <p>1. Environmental advocates and consumer groups are listed generally as key stakeholders. However, they are not described specifically. Please provide specific information of the CSOs that will be engaged for input and in the awareness raising and dissemination campaign.</p> <p>2. Gender elements have been considered adequately; however, suggest to take into consideration points made by the Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note regarding other gender dimensions and inclusion of</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>socioeconomic context in design aspects of the communications campaign, labels, refrigerators, etc.</p> <p>MGV, December 5, 2017:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific institutions have been added to the stakeholders table. Comment cleared. 2. References to additional gender considerations have been included in the gender section and the ToR of the gender consultant. Comment cleared. 	
	<p>8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Please address comments below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not clear where the investment cofinancing to support output 3.2, the replacement demonstration program is coming from. Please clarify. 2. In addition, output 4.3 on the collection and recycling service organization business model does not include an investment component. Please clarify. <p>MGV, December 5, 2017: Thank you for the clarifications and comments cleared. Please take into account our comments below in project implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We hope that additional co-finance can be incorporated into the demonstration program, whether through loans or through other sources. In the 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>case that no additional investment materializes for this output, please consider incorporating adaptive management to make the most out of the GEF investment and ensure the highest potential for replication and scale up.</p> <p>2. Given the potential impact on the GHG benefits achieved via the replacement of refrigerators that the lack of recycling could have due to the potential release of refrigerant gases, we urge the agency to monitor this risk closely and incorporate adaptive management for this output as well in case the refrigerators replaced via the project fail to be recycled.</p>	
	<p>9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.</p>	
	<p>10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.</p>	
	<p>11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes. However, post-project direct is not included in the direct emissions avoided in the Tracking Tool.</p> <p>1. Please revise tracking tool to include both direct (547,462 tCO₂e) and post-project direct (3,093,088 tCO₂e) in the cell for "lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided". In addition, please revise Table F in the CEO MSP Approval Request to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>present one number only, the total direct and indirect emissions.</p> <p>MGV, December 5, 2017:</p> <p>1. Numbers have been updated in the tracking tool and Table F and match along with the annexed EE tool. Comment addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?</p>		
	<p>13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes, this project is part of the programmatic approach "Leapfrogging markets to high efficiency products", which builds on the the SE4ALLL Global Project and involves United for Efficiency, International Copper Association, Collaborative Labeling and Appliance Standards Program, natural Resources Defense Council and other private sector partners. The project is also coordinating with the GEF project "Delivering the transition to energy efficient lighting in Chile," currently under execution under the same arrangements. It will also coordinate with the "Management Plan for HCFC pahes-out in Chile" project, under implementation by the UNDP.</p>	
	<p>14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes</p>	
	<p>15. Does the project have description of knowledge</p>	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	management plan?		
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, November 1, 2017: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	<p>MGV, November 1, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments in boxes 7, 8, 11.</p> <p>In addition, please clarify on Annex C: Status of implementation of the PPG, if the amount committed of \$27,000 means that \$13,000 will not be utilized or if \$27,000 been spent, and the remaining amount of \$13,000 is committed to PPG activities to be carried out in the first year.</p> <p>MGV, December 5, 2017: All comments have been adequately addressed. P.M. recommends circulation to Council. Please incorporate comments in box 7.</p>	
	Review Dates	First Review	November 01, 2017
	Additional Review (as	December 05, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		