



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

GEF ID:	4909		
Country/Region:	Global (Jamaica, Montenegro, Mali, Mauritius, Peru)		
Project Title:	Stabilizing GHG Emissions from Road Transport Through Doubling of Global Vehicle Fuel Economy: Regional Implementation of the Global Fuel Efficiency Initiative (GFEL)		
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-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,077,273
Co-financing:	\$13,460,582	Total Project Cost:	\$15,537,855
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Rob de Jong

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?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes, the participating countries are eligible while the project includes the use of focal area set-aside.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, March 29, 2012: The letters from OFPs for Peru and Mauritius are eligible. As for the other countries, please address the following comments: a) Jamaica: The allocation for project and Agency fee is different from Table D. Please check it. b) Mali: Please submit the English	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>translation of the letter.</p> <p>c) Montenegro: The attached letter is signed by the former OFP. Please provide the letter by the current OFP. In addition, the allocation for project and Agency fee is different from Table D. Please check it.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: a) b) The comments have not been addressed. Please check them. c) The letter dated on April 2 has been submitted. Comment cleared.</p> <p>HT, April 17, 2012: a) The inconsistency in Table D has been amended. Comment cleared. b) Mali has been excluded. Comment cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes. UNEP is implementing the Global Fuel Economy Initiative project in the GEF-4 project cycle.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	HT, March 29, 2012: N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes.	
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? 	HT, March 29, 2012: Mali: Yes. Mauritius: Yes. Montenegro: Yes. Jamaica: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Peru: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	HT, March 29, 2012: Mali: Yes. Mauritius: Yes. Montenegro: Yes. Jamaica: Yes. Peru: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes, it is aligned with CCM-4, especially energy efficiency improvement of the fleet.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes, the objective of CCM-4 (Promote energy efficient, low-carbon transport and urban systems) is identified.	
	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?	HT, March 29, 2012: There are no references or specific information included from the TNAs and NCs. Please clarify further. Regarding Russia, please see the comment in box 14. HT, April 12, 2012: Please add brief description of fuel economy or transport in TNA or NC in the five countries that will be funded by STAR allocations.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>HT, April 17, 2012: Brief description for the targeted countries has been added. 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, March 29, 2012: Not clear. Please explain how the capacities developed at national, regional and global levels will contribute to the long-term goal.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Explanation has been added. Comment cleared.</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, March 29, 2012: No. Please address the following comments.</p> <p>a) There is no description of the baseline projects. In general, examples of baseline projects include: development of government endorsed strategies and policies; government announced investments in programs; and development of legislative frameworks. Funding for baseline projects are identified as co-financing. Please articulate what the baseline projects are. In addition, the description in B.1 is a general assessment at a global level. Since this proposal focuses on policy development at national, regional and global levels, please add problems of targeted countries and regions that the baseline projects seek to address.</p> <p>b) Please add the scenario without the GEF funding. Will the GFEI continue without the GEF funding?</p> <p>c) Characteristics also differ among</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>different fleets (light duty, heavy duty, etc.), which may lead to different policy measures for fuel economy improvements. Please describe them further.</p> <p>d) The descriptions of the window of opportunity are rather poor. For instance, why would the time lag of policy penetration be considered as a factor for the window of opportunity to be only 5 to 10 years? Why would the 20-year delay in total fleet turn-over (which is not fully substantiated) be relevant for the 5-10 year window of opportunity? Please revise.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: a) b) Business-As-Usual scenario and baseline projects have been provided. Comment cleared. c) A focus on light duty vehicle has been added. Comment cleared. d) The description in question has been removed. 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, March 29, 2012: No. Since the baseline project has not been described, it is difficult to judge the incremental reasoning of the proposed activities. After addressing box 11, please revise the incremental and additional cost reasoning in B.2 in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the PIF.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Yes. The incremental cost reasoning has been provided.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>HT, March 29, 2012: No. Please address the following comments.</p> <p>a) Please revisit the project objective while addressing the following comments.</p> <p>b) The long-term goal of GFEI is to improve the global automotive fuel economy from 8L/100km to 4L/100km. Please explain how to measure contribution of this project to the long-term goal.</p> <p>Component #1 (National activities)</p> <p>c) Please be more specific about national policy options to be assessed and implemented. Does that mean fuel efficiency regulations? How about fleet wide fuel efficiency targets, incentives for fuel-efficient vehicles, and other measures? Does the policy focus on cars or include buses and trucks?</p> <p>d) What are the criteria to have chosen the ten countries which are not covered under the STAR allocation? Please explain.</p> <p>e) Is the national project described in B.2 also applied to the ten countries which are not covered under the STAR allocation? Please clarify.</p> <p>f) Improvement of fuel economy in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Russia is already included as the component of the GEF/UNDP project titled "Reducing GHG Emissions from Road Transport in Russia's Medium-sized Cities," which is at the stage of the CEO Endorsement Request. Please explain how to coordinate with the GEF/UNDP project.</p> <p>g) Please add detailed description on how the outputs of the on-going GEF project (i.e. methodology, case study, and toolkit) will be reflected in the proposed activities.</p> <p>Component #2 (Regional replication)</p> <p>h) Fuel economy policy such as fuel efficiency regulations is usually enforced at a national level, because sovereignty lies in a nation. Under such circumstances, what are the merits of a regional approach? Please explain.</p> <p>i) The expected outcomes and outputs in Table B are inconsistent with the description in B.2. The description in B.2 is more understandable than in Table B. If the project expects the outcomes and outputs in Table B, who or what entities have the authority to establish formal regional commitments? How to enforce them? Please reconsider.</p> <p>Component #3 (GFEI communications)</p> <p>j) The on-going GEF project titled "the Global Fuel Economy Initiative" already has the component of outreach and communications. Why are the similar</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>activities needed? How different are the proposed activities from the on-going ones? Please explain.</p> <p>k) How will the project engage and effectively work with vehicle producers, which will ultimately be responsible for bringing fuel efficient vehicles to the market? Please explain.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012:</p> <p>a) The project objective has been revisited in line with the activities. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) An activity to address the comment has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) National policy options have been articulated. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) e) Explanation has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>f) Coordination with the GEF/UNDP project has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) Additional details have been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>h) Explanation has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>i) The inconsistency has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p> <p>j) This comment has not been addressed. Please address it.</p> <p>k) Involvement of the private sector has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>l) The expected outcomes in Table B (Project Framework) should be more concise. Detailed description on activities should be moved to B.2.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>HT, April 17, 2012: j) Activities of the component have been described. Comment cleared. l) Table B and B.2 have been revised. 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, March 29, 2012: Not clear. Please provide the applied methodology and assumptions for estimating GHG emission reductions (i.e. 23Mt-CO₂ /year and 20 Mt/year by 2025 for the 5 STAR allocation countries).</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Methodology to estimate the GHG emission reduction has been provided. 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, March 29, 2012: Please add gender dimensions as the socioeconomic benefits.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Gender considerations have been added. 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, March 29, 2012: Not clear. National NGOs are only mentioned. Public participation and indigeneous people are not mentioned elsewhere. Please explain how public participation is taken into consideration, its role identified and addressed properly.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Description on public participation has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, March 29, 2012: No. Please address the following comments. a) This project can complement the UNDP/GEF project in Russia in the scope of regional and global levels. However, proposed activities at a national level seem to duplicate with the UNDP/GEF project. Please explain. b) Please add coordination with other regional initiatives (ex. Bangkok 2020 Declaration on Sustainable Transport, Bogota Declaration on Sustainable Transport, Amsterdam Declaration on Sustainable Transport). HT, April 12, 2012: a) Complementarity with the GEF/UNDP project has been explained. Comment cleared. b) Coordination with regional initiatives has been explained. Comment cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT, March 29, 2012: No. Please address the following comments: a) Please explain what the FIA Foundation is and their capacity to execute the project. b) Which organizations will execute project activities at national and regional level? Please clarify. c) Are the Ministries listed as national	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>stakeholders responsible for fuel efficiency policies? If not, how to achieve the project objectives with those stakeholders? Please justify.</p> <p>d) What about the ten countries which are not covered under the STAR allocation? Which organizations will execute project activities in those countries? Do they achieve the project objective without the involvement of the national governments? Please explain.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: a) Explanation on the FIA Foundation has been added. However, the description in Project Identification (Part I) should be moved to B.5. b) c) d) Explanations have been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>HT, April 17, 2012: a) The description in Project Identification (Part I) should be moved to B.5. 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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, March 29, 2012: Yes, the percentage of the Project management Cost (PMC) before PMC is 5%.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>HT, March 29, 2012: This will be examined after receiving responses to the comments for other items.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>HT, March 29, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) Please explain the amount of co-financing and co-financers for activities in each component, b) The grant co-financing by UNEP (\$6.7 million) is questionable. Is it included in the UNEP Budget Plan? If it comprises of other sources, please identify specific resources that are committed as part of the initial financial package.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: a) Difficulty to specify co-financing for each component has been explained. Given the nature of the proposal, the explanation is acceptable. Comment cleared. b) The description of Table C is confusing. If US, EU, Germany and Bloomberg Foundation provide co-financing, they should be co-financers, not UNEP. Please revise.</p> <p>HT, April 17, 2012: UNEP has explained it will receive contribution from donors (US, EU, Germany and Bloomberg Foundation) and issue a co-financing commitment</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>letter. Comment cleared.</p> <p>HT, March 29, 2012: Please address the comment in Box 25.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Please address the comment in Box 25.</p> <p>HT, April 17, 2012: Comment cleared.</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"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, March 29, 2012: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments and reflect them in the next version of the PIF. In particular, the PIF clearance will not be recommended without clear baseline projects and incremental cost reasoning. In addition, please submit the endorsement letter signed by the current operational focal point.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2012: Please address the comments in box 2,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		9, 14, 20 and 25. HT, April 17, 2012: All the comments are cleared. PIF clearance is being recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	HT, April 17, 2012: The following items should be considered at the CEO Endorsement stage: a) Reflection of the GEF-4 project outputs into the project framework; b) Conformance with GEF policies in making agreements between the executing agency and the countries; c) Visibility of the GEF financing, including use of the GEF logo on all material, publications, leaflets, brochures and newsletters, websites etc.	
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*	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2012	
	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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.