



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

GEF ID:	5841		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	NAMA Pilot Implementation of Technology Transfer Projects in the Industrial Sector of the Cundinamarca-Bogotá Region		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5190 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,726,484
Co-financing:	\$12,127,460	Total Project Cost:	\$14,053,944
PIF Approval:	June 11, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Oliver Page

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 ?	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes. OFP Alejandra Torres, Head, Office of International Affairs, endorsed the project on April, 25, 2014.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes. As of this day, the total remaining STAR allocation for Colombia amounts to US\$ 5,630,781	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes. As of this day, the total remaining CC focal area	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		allocation for Colombia amounts to US\$ 4,863,900; and BD allocation US\$ 815,082 (with marginal adjustment).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. N/A.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. N/A.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. N/A.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. Not clear. Not clear. The current project proposal does not give any illustration on NAMA readiness and preparations on which the listed NAMA pilot implementation could be built. Furthermore, the proposal also does not explain the GEF incrementality, as there are no baseline activities to justify.</p> <p>Please also provide details on MRV systems and sectoral priorities as per the 2013 technology needs assessment (TNA) carried out in Colombia. Whether those activities are already prepared and/or identified based on earlier studies is still unclear. The proposal suggests the demonstration by piloting and operationalizing the existing mechanisms (Para 9). However, there is no evidence provided of those supporting mechanisms. Please clarify.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant</p>	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. 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>KC, May 09, 2014. Not clear. Please explain further how the proposed four pilot projects shall be of incremental nature and contribute to the national emission reduction targets. Please also elaborate on the types of support systems that will retain sustainability and replicability after completion of the project.</p> <p>Please also see comments in boxes 4 and 7.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. Not clear. Please revise the expected outputs to be more concise.</p> <p>Please revise the Part II text to address the following:</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>2.1. In implementation of appropriate financing mechanism, how has the risk of its sustainability been assessed vis-a-vis resources allocated? Please clarify further how \$1.02 M will assure mitigating the financial risks for sustainable market transformation that is demonstrated through pilot investments.</p> <p>2.3. The activities covered by the GEF resources allocated for the pilots to be successfully implemented are not clear. Please elaborate on incremental</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. No. Please address the following:</p> <p>With regards to the implementation and timing of the technology transfer pilots and how GEF resources will be used to support financial instruments.</p> <p>1. Will the 160 BOP projects be implemented first, and then based on their results, the 37 process and 43 technological adjustment projects be implemented in a subset of those 160 enterprises?</p> <p>2. What exactly are the financial instruments that will be used to finance these process and technological adjustment projects? And how are GEF resources being used to facilitate those investments, which are identified as \$6 million as cofinancing?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reasoning for these activities.</p> <p>Component 1 & 3: Please further elaborate on the baseline activities under these components to justify incremental reasoning. Please also see comments in box 4, related to MRV operationalization.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, January 8, 2015. Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. This will be determined after other comments are addressed.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. The comment is adequately addressed. 48,100 tCO₂e direct emissions expected to be reduced from the 80 technology transfer pilots proposed, with an approximate 481,000 tCO₂e of indirect emissions. More detailed, and validated figures will be submitted at CEO approval stage.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.</p>
	<p>9. 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>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. Yes.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. This will be determined after other comments are addressed in boxes 6 and 7.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. The comments are adequately addressed.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. No. It does not include risks to consequences of climate change.</p> <p>DER/MGV, January 8, 2015. Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. Please ensure that references and data are consistent with the latest National Communication and TNA exercise undertaken. Please submit detailed illustrations of how the proposed NAMA project will be coordinated with the Third National Communication and BUR efforts at the CEO approval stage.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Yes. The comments are adequately addressed.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>KC, May 09, 2014. Please include short descriptions about project innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. This project will pilot technology transfer as per energy assessment through 80 pilots identified with appropriate mitigation potentials. This framework will introduce NAMA framework with Measurement, Reporting, and Verification system. This initiative aims to assure sustainability and replication with the adoption of incentive scheme where the GEF grant would constitute 20% of investment in the promoted pilots, with the remaining 80% to be funded by the industry including private sectors.</p>	<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes. The project will promote the transfer and adoption of best industry practices and low-carbon technologies in the industry sector leading to energy savings and GHG emissions reductions. It will implement pilot projects in best operative energy practices (BOPs) in 160 companies, catalyzing the implementation of 80 process and technology reconversion, innovation and adaptation projects. The experience will be replicated through a NAMA model for the industry sector. Sustainability will be ensured through the capacity building and support tools designed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	KC, May 09, 2014. To be determined. Please see comments in Box 4, 6, 7 and 8. KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. The comments are adequately addressed.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	KC, May 09, 2014. No. Table C indicates no co-financing from UNDP. Please justify the agency's ownership factor. Please include UNDP co-financing. Please describe UNDP's expertise and experiences in NAMA readiness/development and implementation in general and for the Colombian context. KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Comments cleared.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	KC, May 09, 2014. Yes. PMC within 10%.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?	KC, May 09, 2014. Not yet. The output of the PPG activities should be readily available for the upcoming national reports and identified prioritized NAMAs in industrial sub-/-sector.	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</u>	KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. Comments cleared.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. N/A.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. NA.
	• Convention Secretariat?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. NA.
	• The Council?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. NA.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. NA.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>KC, may 09, 2014. Please address the above mentioned comments in boxes 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 17 and 19. Please elaborate further on the rationale for GEF investment and support activities for NAMA pilots to be determined later.</p> <p>KC, June 09, 2014. Yes. The PIF has been redesigned in consultation with the GEF agency, to adequately address GEF concerns. Comments cleared. Please note that proposed PIF will be approved if the resources are available.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	KC, June 9, 2014. List of deliverables at	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<p>PPG Stage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed estimate (with methodology) for direct and indirect (incl. post-project) GHG emission reductions for all pilots NAMA implementations. 2. The selection of appropriate NAMA based on mitigation potential within industrial sector will be identified to introduce pilot approach. 3. Updated and detailed implementation plan for the priority NAMA based on the PPG assessment will be submitted. <p>List of deliverables at CEO approval request on supported NAMAs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entry to the UNFCCC NAMA Registry Portal for matching with GEF support (including PPG support). For more information please see GEF/UNDP Azerbaijan matching for both PPG and Project grant on UNFCCC NAMA Registry page. 2. Submission of final co-financing letters as applicable including GEF agency. 3. Duly filled CCM tracking tool. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>DER/MGV, Dec 15, 2015. Not at this time. Please address comments on boxes 7 and 11.</p> <p>DER/MGV, January 8, 2015. All comments cleared. The program manager recommends CEO MSP approval.</p>
	First review*	May 09, 2014	December 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 09, 2014	January 08, 2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.**