



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

GEF ID:	4948		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Technology Needs Assessment		
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-6; CCM-6; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,815,080
Co-financing:	\$2,036,921	Total Project Cost:	\$7,852,001
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Lawrence Agbemabiese

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?	<p>CCA-JS Please see comment in section 6.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: There is no finalized list of countries where the project would be implemented.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: There are no endorsement letters for each country where the project would be implemented.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: the project is a grant.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 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"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Activities that are not strict TNA preparation activities can not be funded by the global set aside and would need to be funded by national CCM STAR allocation with appropriate endorsement letters.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:  a) Please consider taking Component 3 out of the proposal since it does not appear to focus on TNA preparation activities.  b) Please also clarify the mechanism considered in Component 2 as it also seems not to focus on TNA preparation activities.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013:  Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	The SCCF does not have sufficient funds in this Work Program to accomodate the proposed project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set aside?</li> </ul>	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Requests of	

		<p>not go beyond strict TNA preparation activities since the resource of the set-aside are limited.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:  a) Please consider taking Component 3 out of the proposal since it does not appear to focus on TNA preparation activities.  b) Please also clarify the mechanism considered in Component 2 as it also seems not to focus on TNA preparation activities.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013:  Cleared.</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: See Q8.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. The CCM objective relevant to technology needs assessment is CCM-6.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:  Cleared</p>	
	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?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: This is a global project. The TNA part of the project stems from Decision 4/CP.13 of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, which requested the GEF to elaborate a strategic programme to scale up investment on technology transfer, and the resulting GEF Council-approved document that was also endorsed by the Conference of the Parties in Poznan in December 2008.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Unable to assess.</p> <p>CCM/FI - Sep 18, 2012:</p>	

		<p>mechanism of component 2. The project framework describes it as aiming at "providing technology information critical to undertaking and documenting climate change technology needs" while paragraph 16 page 6 mentions mechanisms aimed at promoting "exchange of experience and information between countries". Please also see address Q6's comment.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<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>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. Component 2 and 3 do not seem to take into account the activities planned in the pilot regional climate technology networks the GEF will be financing.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: This comment was not taken into account. For instance, the project does not seem to have identified the complementarity (or redundancy) it would have with the activities planned in the pilot regional climate technology networks the GEF will be financing.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013: 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>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Unable to assess.</p> <p>CCM/FI - Sep 18, 2012:</p>	

	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No.</p> <p>a) Going further than usual countries' TNAs into preparing action plans and project proposals would suppose strong links with potential donors to ensure the relevance of such work with their quality check and funding criteria. The project does not appear to ensure this, for instance, no multilateral bank appear involved.</p> <p>b) Component 2 aims at the creation of Implementation support Agencies in each country providing numerous services to facilitate the implementation of technology action plans. The financial sustainability of these agencies is not ensured by the current proposal. See also Q11.</p> <p>c) Component 3 is still too vaguely designed at this stage and does not provide information on how such networking events may sustain further practical actions rather than just be one shot communication operations. See also Q11.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: The previous comments have not yet been sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>a) The project description does not yet clarify whether and how it would develop strong links with potential donors to ensure the relevance of the project's work (action plans and associated projects' proposals) with the quality check and funding criteria of these potential donors.</p> <p>b) Cleared</p> <p>c) The new Component 3 appears more focused on engaging activities for the</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>Networks of the UNFCCC rather than on ensuring the success of TNAs' implementation. Please address Q6's comment.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared.</p> <p>It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will detail how the activities of the project will avoid any redundancy with what the CTCN will be responsible for.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: This project mostly involves capacity building at this stage and does not present estimations of emission reductions impacts.</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>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: A description is provided but the benefits associated with component 2 and 3 remain uncertain (see Q16).</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: Although the response provided indicates that Component 3 will partly aim at establishing a network forum /linkage to potential funding partners, the description of component 3 in the project framework table and in paragraph 10 appear insufficiently focused to clarify whether the project will effectively implement activities allowing to identify and discuss with donors for the priority technologies, actions and projects identified following TNA and TAP finalization. Please address Q6's and Q14's comments.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared.</p>	

	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012:  a) No participation of representatives of potential technology users (public, private sector or households) is anticipated.  b) There is no involvement of the Ministries in charge of finance and fiscal laws for when technology transfer incentives or disincentives removal are considered.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:  a) Please clarify whether the project will enable the participation of representatives of households as potential technology users. Details on the means to enable the participation of potential technology users from the public and private sectors are expected for CEO endorsement.  b) Cleared.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013:  Cleared.  It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify how key government stakeholders, beyond the Ministries in charge of climate change, will be involved to achieve a strong political commitment and involvement of national authorities.</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>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Unable to assess. See previous comments.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:  Please clarify how the project will mitigate the risk of not finding donors to fund the identified priority actions, technologies and projects coming out of TNAs and TAPs.</p>	

		FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: See Q11.  CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: See Q11.  FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Unable to assess. See previous comments.  CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: Cleared	
	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?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: The rationale for the proposed budget with reference to the previous UNEP TNA support project funded by the GEF is not explained.  CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: The cost per country is similar to what was approved for the previous TNA support project GEF ID 3907 (\$300,000 per country). Cleared.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Unable to assess. See previous comments.  CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012:	



		<p>other comments first.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Cleared. The CEO endorsement request is expected to clarify how sufficient means will be devoted to the involvement of the funding community.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: The co-financing ratio is much too low.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: The co-financing ratio (1:0.26) is lower than for the previous TNA support project (1:0.35). Please increase the co-financing to a higher level than for the previous TNA support project.</p> <p>FJ - Feb 1, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. UNEP is providing less than 1% of the project cost.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: Cleared. UNEP is now providing 2% of the project cost.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: n.a.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	No. The SCCF does not have sufficient resources.  CCM/FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No.  CCM/FJ - Sep 18, 2012: No. Please address the above comments.  FJ - Jan 17, 2013: Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	FJ - Jan 17, 2013: a) It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will detail how the activities of the project will avoid any redundancy with what the CTCN will be responsible for. b) It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify how key government stakeholders, beyond the Ministries in charge of climate change, will be involved to achieve a strong political commitment and involvement of national authorities. c) The CEO endorsement request is expected to clarify how sufficient means will be devoted to the involvement of the funding community.	
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*	April 18, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 18, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 01, 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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
<b>PPG Budget</b>	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	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.