



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

GEF ID:	4682		
Country/Region:	Global (Colombia, Kenya, Swaziland)		
Project Title:	SolarChill Development, Testing and Technology Transfer Outreach		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,583,000
Co-financing:	\$5,662,900	Total Project Cost:	\$8,245,900
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anna Lerner	Agency Contact Person:	Geordie Colville

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?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CA/AL, 20 Sept 2011: Endorsements from Kenya and Swaziland are attached. Colombia endorsement is for the cancelled World Bank submission from 2009. A new endorsement for the UNEP re-submission is needed. AL, 23 Sept, 2011: A letter from Colombia has been received by the GEFSEC. Comment addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes. This project is a re-submission of an earlier project cancelled by the World Bank, which did not have a clear comparative advantage to carry it out. UNEP has a comparative advantage in this field. UNEP has been working with the SolarChill Consortium since its inception. UNEP is further	

		Swaziland and Colombia to develop and implement their HCFC phase out management plans in the same sector. UNEP is well placed to implement regional projects and has taken notes of challenges experienced by the previous implementing agency.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	AL, 20 Sept: N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes. Given the past 10 years of collaboration between UNEP and SolarChill partners substantial institutional memory will support the implementation of this project.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	CA/AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes. This is a re-submission of a cancelled project from GEF-4, and the CEO has agreed to utilize the resources allocated to the cancelled PIF from the Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	AL, 20 Sept 2011: From resources from the cancelled earlier submission by the World Bank	
	Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	AL, 20 Sept: Yes, please add CCM-1 in the "focal area objective" box in table A.

		AL, 23 Sept, 2011: Comment addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes. This project contributes the transfer of innovative technology.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes. At the CEO endorsement, please clarify further the project aims to ensure the sustainability of the SolarChill production capacity in the participating countries.	
	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?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	
Project Design	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	

	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>AL, 20 Sept: AL, 20 Sept 2011: Since this is a re-submission, please ensure that the project framework has similar objectives, components, outcomes, and outputs as the original version. If there are any improvements/changes, please summarize in the main text. Please consider the following specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised project objectives appear to be quite different from the objective specified in the original submission. As the original objective appears to be still valid, please revise the current version. If differentiation/further descriptions are needed, we suggest to do so primarily in the text. -Change the order of the activities so they are coherent with the previous PIF (1. Development, evaluation and testing of solar chill A, 2. Procurement.. etc) - Please re-name the two procurement components to be INV instead of TA <p>AL, 23 Sept, 2011: Changes have been done in line with GEFSEC suggestions. The log frame and project design is now very similar to the original submission. Comment addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>AL, 20 Sept: Yes</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</p>	<p>AL, 20 Sept: Yes</p>	

	achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	
	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)	AL, 20 Sept: Yes. Please put a short summary to explain the challenges faced by the previous implementing agency and how this will be addressed by this re-submission. AL, 23 Sept, 2011: Additional information is inserted under A.1.1 and we take note that the project proponents have learned from the challenges of previous submission. Comment is addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	CA/AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes. Please further clarify linkages and coordination with other private sector-led and donor/MLF-supported initiatives by CEO endorsement. AL, 23 Sept, 2011: The linkages and plans for ensuring coordination have been inserted in section B6. Comment is addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes	
	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?	AL, 20 Sept: Yes.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>CA/AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes, the overall co-financing is approximately \$500,000 higher than the cancelled World Bank submission.</p> <p>The WB submission had \$3,000,000 from private sector co-financing. Private sector engagement is a crucial component of successful technology transfer. Besides the Palfridge co-financing (1.068M), please describe any other sources with private sector contributions. For instance, if Solar Chill Partners include private sector contributions, please indicate as such.</p> <p>AL, 23 Sept, 2011: We note that funding and co-finance is allocated between the components reflecting the original submission and private sector involvement is highlighted. Comment addressed.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>CA/AL, 20 Sept, 2011: amount of co-financing appears to be adequate, the distribution among the project components needs improvement. Please address the following:</p> <p>- Component 1: In the previous submission, the procurement of Solar Chill A (component 2) had GEF financing of \$1,073m, and co-financing of \$0.25m. The current submission has a similar GEF financing level and</p>	

		<p>1.69m. While we note that the current version has 80 extra Solar Chill A installations, the co-financing increase by \$1.44m seems extremely high. Please reduce the co-financing from this component, and increase the co-financing for the procurement of SolarChill A (component 3) and technology transfer (component 5).</p> <p>- Component 5: The technology transfer activities used to have co-financing of 3m. Please consider increasing the co-financing by at least 1.44m so that the original level of co-financing can be maintained.</p> <p>- Component 6: The monitoring and evaluation should be a shared responsibility, not just for the GEF to bear. Please allocate some co-financing.</p> <p>AL, 23 Sept, 2011: The distribution of co-financing between the project components is reallocated in a adequate way. The co-financing reflects the original submission well. All comments addressed.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CA/AL, 20 Sept 2011: Yes. The original WB submission had zero WB co-financing. This re-submission includes \$230,000 of UNEP co-financing.	
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?		
	29. Has the Agency responded		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	CA/AL, 20 Sept, 2011: Not yet. AL, 23 Sept 2011: Yes, PIF is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	CA 20 Sept 2011: Please reduce the GEF allocation to the PPG amount, including agency fee, to be \$145,000. Please significantly reduce the total amount allocated to analysis on potential for cooperation with MLF and bi-lateral programs, and also ensure that the reduced cost is shared with co-financing. Please significantly increase the total co-financing for the PPG. Please provide co-financing for

		AL, 23 Sept, 2011: Changes are made and funding and co-finance is adequate. Comments addressed.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	CA, 20 Sept, 2011: Not yet. Please address the above. AL, 23 Sept, 2011: Yes, PPG is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2011

* 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.