



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT\*  
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	<b>9436</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Chile, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Sudan, Tunisia, South Africa)</b>		
Program Title:	<b>Leapfrogging Markets to High Efficiency Products (Appliances, including Lighting, and Electrical Equipment) (Resubmission of #9083)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP, DBSA and UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1 Program 1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Program Grant:	<b>\$30,362,753</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$149,941,000</b>	Total Program Cost:	<b>\$180,303,753</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
Program Manager:	<b>David Elrie Rodgers</b>	Agency Contact Person:	

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comments</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Program Consistency</b>	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes. This program is a re-submission of PFD #9083 which has been approved by Council. The program is fully aligned with GEF-6 focal area objectives. The PFD is being re-submitted to add additional child projects.	
	2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes. This program is a re-submission of PFD #9083 which has been approved by Council. The program is fully aligned with GEF-6 focal area objectives. The PFD is being re-submitted to add additional child	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<b>Program Design</b>	<p>funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>projects. The following new child projects are being submitted: Chile; Indonesia; Myanmar; Tunisia; and South Africa</p>	
	<p>3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2016. This program is a re-submission of PFD #9083 which has been approved by Council. Table B reflects the inclusion of additional child projects.</p> <p>Please address the following comments:</p> <p>1) Please clarify if any of the project components have changed since the submission of the first PFD, and if so, please explain.</p> <p>2) Based on the large number of child projects, please provide a one-page summary table those shows each child project, including the global project; the responsible agency; the funding amounts; and a very brief summary of the top priorities for the child project, including which appliances or technologies will be the focus.</p> <p>3) For Indonesia, please justify why two agencies will be implementing the project. Please describe the division of labor and responsibilities of the UNDP and UNEP in the child project.</p> <p>4) For South Africa, please justify why two agencies will be implementing the project. Please more fully describe the division of labor and responsibilities of the UNDP and DBSA in the child project.</p> <p>5) The GEB estimate on page 19 appears to be consistent with the first PFD submission which only included 3 child projects. Please clarify if the in the PFD</p>	<p>UNEP Response on March 28, 2016</p> <p>1. The components have remained the same.</p> <p>2. Please see Annex I below for our response to this comment.</p> <p>3. The project was submitted with two GEF agencies due to the complementary strengths of both agencies. UNEP, with its en.lighten initiative, has strong technical capacities and experience in implementing national projects to develop the policy framework for energy efficient lighting. While UNDP has the experience and country presence in Indonesia to work with local industry and development of demonstration projects and financial mechanisms. Therefore it has been agreed that UNDP will implement Component 1 (Support to local industry) and 2 (High efficiency lighting technology penetration), while UNEP will implement Component 2 (policy framework). UNDP will be the lead agency and receive the PPG.</p> <p>4. The project was submitted with two GEF agencies due to the complementary strengths of both agencies. UNDP and DBSA will be jointly implementing the project so that South Africa benefits from the complementary strengths of both institutions: - UNDP's proven experience with supporting countries to establish Energy Efficiency policies, including its experience in South Africa for the implementation of the GEF-financed project "Market transformation through energy efficiency standards and</p>

		<p>should be updated as the GHG figure matches the figure on page 18 for all eight child projects.</p> <p>6) Please indicate if PPGs will be requested for the child projects and if those requests will come before or after June 2016.</p> <p>DER, March 31, 2016. All comments cleared.</p>	<p>labeling of appliances in South Africa". UNDP is therefore best positioned to lead the implementation of the policy components of the project (Components 1, 2, 3 and 5) building on the experiences/lessons-learned from previous energy efficiency projects. -DBSA's proven experience with establishing and managing financial mechanisms (including South Africa's Green Fund) and implementing investment projects. DBSA is therefore uniquely positioned to lead the development of a financial mechanism and support to local industry (Component 4).</p> <p>5. The CO2 emissions were already updated for the child project, previously they were 1,530,245 tons with 3 child projects and now they are 10,158,095 tons with 8 child projects. The text in table incorrectly stated "only 3 child country projects" this has now been updated to "only 8 child country projects".</p> <p>6. PPG requests will be submitted to all 5 child projects before June 2016.</p>
	4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes.	
	5. Does the program 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)	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes.	
	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	DER, March 21, 2016. NA	

	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes. Please ensure that child projects are developed in coordination with countries INDCs.	
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, March 21, 2016. As there are many agencies involved in this program, please explicate the responsibilities for submission of PPGs, CEO endorsements, tracking tools, PIRs, and other GEF required reports.  DER, March 31, 2016. Annex provided which clearly documents each agencies role. Comment cleared.	Please see Annex II below for our response to this comment.
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes.	
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	11. 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>	DER, March 21, 2016. Yes. This program is a re-submission of PFD #9083 which has been approved by Council. The program is fully aligned with GEF-6 focal area objectives. The PFD is being re-submitted to add additional child projects. The following new child projects are being submitted: Chile; Indonesia; Myanmar; Tunisia; and South Africa.  STAR Allocation and CCM allocation for the five new child projects is sufficient to cover the amount requested.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>DER, March 21, 2016. Yes. This program is a re-submission of PFD #9083 which has been approved by Council. The program is fully aligned with GEF-6 focal area objectives. The PFD is being re-submitted to add additional child projects. The following new child projects are being submitted: Chile; Indonesia; Myanmar; Tunisia; and South Africa.</p> <p>STAR Allocation and CCM allocation for the five new child projects is sufficient to cover the amount requested: Chile has \$6.4 million CCM STAR allocation remaining; the requested child project is within that amount. Indonesia has \$14 million CCM STAR allocation remaining; the requested child project is within that amount. Myanmar has \$14.9 million CCM STAR allocation remaining; the requested child project is within that amount. Tunisia has \$2.6 million CCM STAR allocation remaining; the requested child project is within that amount and will consume all remaining CCM resources. South Africa has \$12.7 million CCM STAR allocation remaining; the requested child project is within that amount, leaving a balance of approximately \$1 million.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	

**Secretariat Recommendation**

<b>PFD Clearance</b>	<b>Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?</b>	DER, March 21, 2016. not at this time. Please address the comments in boxes 3 and 8.  DER, March 31, 2016. All comments cleared. The program manager recommends technical clearance.	
	<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Review*	March 21, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.