



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

GEF ID:	<b>5199</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Colombia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Demonstration and Assessment of Battery-electric Vehicles for Mass Transit in Colombia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IADB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1; CCM-1; CCM-4; CCM-4; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$29,900,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$32,100,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>April 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Hiroaki Takiguchi</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Francisco Arango</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT, November 8, 2012: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, November 8, 2012: Yes, an endorsement letter was signed by Mrs. Alejandra TORRES in the amount of \$2,486,000.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	HT, November 8, 2012: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	HT, November 8, 2012: There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	HT, November 8, 2012: Yes.	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Yes, the proposed grant is within the STAR allocation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Yes, the proposed grant is within CC mitigation focal area.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) The PIF identifies CCM-1 as the focal area objectives. Please explain how innovative the proposed technology (e.g. battery-electric vehicles) is in light of the country's situation. b) The proposal is also aligned with CCM-4 (promote energy efficient, low-carbon transport and urban systems). Please consider to add CCM-4 as one of the objectives.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. b) CCM-4 has been added as one of the objectives. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the comment in box 7.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: The PIF describes that a number of measures currently under assessment</p>	

	<p>conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>NAMAs. Is there a possibility that actions supported with this project will be adopted as NAMAs? If that is the case, please include it in the project objectives.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Explanation has been provided. In response to the future progress in NAMA policies in Colombia, this should be elaborated in the project preparation stage if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Yes, the proposal includes development of standards and regulations as well as design of financial mechanisms, which are expected to contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: As the baseline project, the proposal identifies 100km of the BRT system in Bogota. Is all of the system already available? Please explain the timeframe of the baseline project.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		

	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: This will be examined after receiving responses to the comments for other items.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) Please justify why the battery-electric vehicle is the best option in comparison with other articulated buses (e.g. hybrid bus, hydrogen bus, etc.)</p> <p>Component 2: b) According to the PIF, the development cost of an articulated, battery-electric bus is \$20 million. Given the number of tested buses (10), is the approximate cost of the single bus \$2 million? Please explain. c) Please provide the cost estimate to build a bus charging station.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. b) The Project Framework (Table B) includes 10 articulated, battery-electric buses tested as one of the outputs (Component 2) while the text in B.2. describes 8 to 10 buses. Please be consistent in the number of the buses. c) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>HT, January 22, 2012: b) 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, November 8, 2012: The proposal assumes that annual distance travelled per bus is 70,000 km. Given 350 days as operational days a year, the assumption is equivalent to 200 km per day. Taking into consideration the distance per battery charge (i.e. 50 km or less), the bus requires at least four times of battery charge a day. Is that feasible? Please explain.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: The range of 200 km per charge seems relatively optimistic. This should be considered in the project preparation stage if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please add a benefit in gender dimensions that air pollutant reduction and improved quality of mass transit transport bring.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Yes, the project is expected to improve quality of public transport and enhance awareness on electric buses.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Coordination among project partners could be a high risk. Please address the comment in box 20.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: Please address the comment in box 20.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the following comments:</p>	

	<p>region?</p>	<p>by C40-CCI dated on April 24, 2012, the C40-CCI Latin America Hybrid &amp; Electric Bus Test Program, which is supported by IDB, includes a test in Bogota starting April 2012. Are the results of the test already available? How will the results be reflected in the current proposal?</p> <p>b) The Climate Technology Fund (CTF) has funded the Strategic Public Transportation Systems Program Project for Colombia, which was submitted by IDB. The project includes an activity setting the stage for the introduction of new low-carbon bus technology. How is the current proposal differentiated from the existing CTF project?</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: a) b) Explanations have been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Not clear. Will C40-CCI serve as the only executing agency? Does C40-CCI have a permanent office in Bogota? If so, how many staffs are there in the office? Does C40-CCI have experiences to handle \$30 million projects? While C40-CCI can be one of the partners of the project, please consider to designate other entities (i.e. national and/or local governments) as executing agencies.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: According to the fiduciary standards for GEF agencies (GEF/C.31/6), the IDB is requested to exercise oversight of the project through project appraisal standards, procurement processes, and</p>	

		<p>etc. How will the IDB be committed to keeping the fiduciary standards in case of this project? Please explain.</p> <p>HT, January 22, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Yes. The percentage of the Project Management Cost (PMC) before PMC (<math>4.8\% = 100,000/2,100,000</math>) is less than 5%.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) Please address the comment in box 14. b) Since the GEF puts high priority on sustaining the project effects, please consider adding the GEF finance for Component 3 and decreasing the GEF finance for Component 4.</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012: a) Comment cleared. b) The GEF finances for Components 3 and 4 have been reallocated. Comment cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>HT, November 8, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) Given the nature of the project, please consider adding co-financing from local</p>	

		<p>b) As the co-financing sources, the proposal lists in-kind contributions from Express del Futuro (\$6.5 million) and BYD Company Limited (\$20 million). Please be more specific about the in-kind contributions (e.g. procurement of electric buses, operational cost of the demonstration, labor costs etc.).</p> <p>HT, December 20, 2012:  a) Coordination with local governments, including co-financing, should be elaborated in the project preparation stage if the PIF is cleared. Comment cleared.  b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>HT, November 8, 2012:  Yes, IDB is going to finance \$2.85 million in total for the project.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>HT, November 8, 2012:  Not at this stage. Please address the above comments.</p>	



		<p>Please address the comments in box 14 and 20.</p> <p>HT, January 22, 2012: All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, January 22, 2012: Please address the following items by the CEO Endorsement stage:</p> <p>a) follow-up of Colombia's NAMA policies; b) assessment of the distance travelled by battery-electric bus per battery charge; c) detailed arrangement of project implementation/execution, including the IDB's role.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 08, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 22, 2013	
	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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
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.