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

GEF ID:	**9354**		
Country/Region:	**Colombia**		
Project Title:	**Public Lighting Energy Efficiency Program: Public lighting replacement of low-efficiency VSAP bulbs with high-efficiency LEDs in Colombia**		
GEF Agency:	**IADB**	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:		Project Grant:	**$1,999,725**
Co-financing:	**$25,850,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$27,849,725**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jose Juan Gomes,**

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, December 29, 2015: The project is aligned with GEF-6 CCM Objective 1, Program 1: Promote innovation, technology transfer and supportive policies and strategies. Please also include Outcome B under Focal Area Outcomes if appropriate for this project. MGV, February 2, 2015: Ok. Comment cleared.	
	2. Is the project structure/	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	

[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
	design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, December 29, 2015: The components are descriptive and well designed. However, we note the lack of any project activities to secure municipal government commitment to LED street light replacement through promoting regulatory development, standards setting, or capacity building. Please explain if such activities targeted at municipal governments should be included, and if not, how municipal stakeholders will be engaged in the project. MGV, February 2, 2015: Thank you for your response. Please elaborate on whether the program in its support to municipalities, identification and engagement of technology providers and	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		other stakeholders, and development of standards, will cover the environmentally sound disposal of the high-pressure sodium-vapor lamps that will be replaced or if there already exists a life plan in place for those lamps at a municipal level. This is important as they may contain mercury.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
	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)	MGV, December 29, 2015: Please include risks due to consequences of climate change. MGV, February 2, 2015: Comment not cleared. While climate change does not pose a major risk to the project, please include reasoning from Agency Response it in the table under Part 6 as indicated.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Cofinancing from FINDETER is included and confirmed. However, there is no cofinancing listed from the implementing agency, IADB. Please identify and include resources from IADB that will be dedicated to this project or justify why IADB would seek to implement this project without co-financing. MGV, February 2, 2015: Ok. Comment cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes, however, we noticed a typo in the emission calculation document. The units for the listed emission factor of 0.374 should be tons per MWh not tons per KWh. Please clarify and re-submit. MGV, February 2, 2015: Ok. Comment cleared.	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	MGV, December 29, 2015: N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes	
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, December 29, 2015: Yes. Colombia has a STAR allocation of $52,124,136, of which it has utilized $15,260,000, leaving a remaining $36,864,136. The proposed project is within those resources.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Yes. Colombia has a CCM allocation of $10,377,586, of which it has utilized $2,725,000, leaving a remaining $7,652,586. The proposed project is within those resources.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	MGV, December 29, 2015: N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	MGV, December 29, 2015: N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	MGV, December 29, 2015: N/A	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	MGV, December 29, 2015: Please address comments on Boxes 1, 6, 9, 10, and 11. MGV, February 2, 2015: Please address comments on Boxes 6 and 9.	
Review Dates	First Review	December 29, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 02, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		