



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

GEF ID:	9083		
Country/Region:	Global (Costa Rica, Kazakhstan, Sudan)		
Program Title:	Leapfrogging Markets to High Efficiency Products (Appliances, including Lighting, and Electrical Equipment)(PROGRAM)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP and UNDP	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:		Program Grant:	\$10,370,000
Co-financing:	\$55,781,000	Total Program Cost:	\$66,151,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Ruth Coutto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	DER, March 31, 2015. For Table A, the project is aligned with CC 1: Promote Innovation, Technology Transfer, and Supportive Policies and Strategies; Program 1: Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of lowcarbon technologies and mitigation options.	N/A
	2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed	DER, March 31, 2015. The proposal describes the critical role for promoting energy efficient appliances in many developing countries and articulates a programmatic approach that will blend	UNEP Response to March 31, 2015 a) A preliminary list of countries has been developed based on the below criteria: 1. The country has an available GEF-6 STAR allocation remaining;

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)?

<p>Program Design</p>	<p>using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>global services and specific child projects in countries that commit STAR allocation. The innovative design proposes a short menu of project activities that would be common across all child projects. The proposal includes one country child project at this stage, but anticipates additional child projects to be included in the program. Please respond to the following comments:</p> <p>a) Please clarify the list of countries that may enroll child projects.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the expected timetable for potential enrollment of the child projects. Is there a deadline when all child projects will be confirmed?</p> <p>c) Please further describe how the priority activities of the global services function will be aligned with the priority activities funded by STAR in the child projects. Are all the activities in the child projects to be aligned with the global services in order to be eligible?</p> <p>d) There is some confusion about which countries will be served by this program versus project 5831. Please explain what is meant by serving 15 countries. Will there be 15 child projects? If not, will the number of countries served be reduced to match the number of child projects?</p> <p>e) There is some confusion about the partner countries 30 being expanded to 100. In the explanatory graph requested in box 7, please include the country count delineation.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015.</p> <p>a) The four countries submitting letters of endorsement for child projects include</p>	<p>2. The country has expressed their interest in developing a GEF project on energy efficient lighting, appliances, and equipment to either UNEP or UNDP. Currently the countries are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asia: China & Myanmar • Middle East and North Africa: Tunisia • Sub-Saharan Africa: Djibouti • Latin America and the Caribbean: Haiti and Honduras <p>Please note, this is a preliminary list as country prioritization will be an outcome of the SE4ALL Global Project #5831.</p> <p>Further, the submitted child project's must comply with the criteria as is described below and Child Selection Criteria Section of the PFD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National statements expressing governmental commitment to advance energy efficiency in appliances and equipment and/or joining the country partnership programme. 2. The child project advances a permanent and sustainable transition to high efficiency products particularly through the inclusion of minimum energy performance standards and other aspects of the integrated policy approach as is described in the description of Component 1. When justified, the child project may vary from the integrated policy approach with adequate justification and ensuring the project results in a permanent and sustainable transition. 3. The child projects should address the products of focus (refrigerators, room air conditioners, electric motors, distribution transformers, water heaters, lamps and
------------------------------	---	---	--

		<p>Costa Rica, Sudan, South Africa, and Kazakhstan. The listed four countries have submitted LOEs by July 31, 2015. Comment cleared. In addition to the above four countries, other countries that have expressed interest include: China & Myanmar; Tunisia; Djibouti; Haiti; and Honduras.</p> <p>b) The agencies have proposed a commitment deadline by which all child projects will be submitted as March 2018. This is acceptable. However, the question asked was not answered. The question is when will the agency confirm all child projects. If child projects beyond the four above are pursued, the agency will need to submit a revised PFD for council approval, along with the LOEs from the new countries. Please clarify the deadline for submitting any revised PFD for council approval.</p> <p>c) Alignment will be ensured along with demand driven response. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) The response says the program will support up to 15 countries with direct support, even if they are not child projects. Funds will come from the global child project. However, Annex 1 says 10 countries. Please clarify.</p> <p>e) The two projects work in tandem. According to the agency response, thirty countries will join under the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) and an additional 70 will join under the Global Leapfrogging Program. Comment cleared.</p> <p>Comments on the child project concepts</p>	<p>controls, and other potential priority products such as pumps, TVs, computers and set-top boxes). However if national circumstances differ from the norm, the countries have the flexibility to include different electrical products when justified based on benefits including large GHG reduction potential.</p> <p>4. Adequate co-finance is provided by national partners and stakeholders, showing the country's commitment to the project.</p> <p>b) Child projects will be accepted up to March 2018 for the Program, which will still allow ample time for project preparation and project implementation during the sixty-six month timeframe of the program.</p> <p>c) Yes, the child projects will remain consistent with the global services, such as the integrated policy approach and the products included. However, the project will follow a demand driven approach based on the specific needs of the country, allowing variation in the form products or approach when it is justified.</p> <p>d) Under Component 2 of the Global Leapfrogging Program, 15 countries will be supported with in-country support, such as training to enhance national capacities. Under SE4ALL Global Project (#5831), the objective is to get countries to commit to transitioning their markets to energy efficient products, and the project will develop country savings assessments and best practice policy guidance to gain this commitment. However, SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) does not include in country support to ensure a successful market transformation, which is</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>1) For child projects that cover refrigeration and air conditioning, please include language in the project activities that documents support for global and country efforts to adopt very low or zero GWP refrigerants.</p> <p>2) Costa Rica. Child concept is adequate. During project preparation, please consider if any support for strengthened regulatory programs is needed.</p> <p>3) Sudan. Child concept is adequate.</p> <p>4) South Africa. The child project is quite large (\$10 million) and includes a sizable investment component. Please justify the project size. Also, please clarify how the proposed project will build on the foundations of existing GEF projects in South Africa. Please also elaborate on how the investment in LED street lighting can be made sustainable and replicable. Also please clarify if this is one child project or two child projects.</p> <p>5) Kazakhstan. Child concept is adequate.</p> <p>f) Global child project. Please clarify the number of countries to be supported and insure alignment with Table B in the PFD and all the Annexes. On page 6 of the global child project concept it provides GHG emissions benefit for 14 countries. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, August 28, 2015.</p> <p>b) The agency is proposing that the PFD</p>	<p>one reason why fund only claims 33% of the total non-OECD savings potential. The 15 countries that are supported under Component 2 do not necessarily have to be Child Projects. The countries that are supported will be selected based on their national commitment to advance their market (for example by being a partner to the project) and the Program will also ensure a regional spread of the project partners.</p> <p>e) Agreed, a new figure has been added to address this misunderstanding. Thirty countries will join under the SE4ALL Global Project and an additional 70 will join under the Global Leapfrogging Program. See Annex I.</p> <p>UNEP response to August 11, 2015 comments</p> <p>b. The revised PFD will be submitted to the June 2018 council meeting for approval at the latest, in the meantime as groups of new countries submit LOE we will request a revision to the PFD to include them in the programme on a rolling basis.</p> <p>d. This has been updated ‘the program will support 15 non-GEF child project countries with training. In addition the program will support 10 GEF child country projects with training.</p> <p>Comments on the Child Project</p> <p>1) Agreed, text has been added to both the child projects and the PFD stating that support will be provided to transition to low or zero GWP refrigerants.</p> <p>2) Costa Rica - Agreed ‘regulatory mechanisms will be further considered at</p>
--	--	---

		<p>will remain open for new country partners and may be submitted as a revised PFD as late as June 2018 council meeting (the final council meeting in GEF-6.) Agency also suggests submitting the PFD revisions on a rolling basis. Before agreeing to this, program manager needs to consult with operational staff.</p> <p>d) Comment cleared.</p> <p>Child projects</p> <p>1) Text added and clarified that the program will support transition to low or zero GWP refrigerants. Comment cleared.</p> <p>2) Comment cleared.</p> <p>4) Large size project in South Africa is defended in the response, however, the justification is not clear. Specifically, the UNDP project 2692, "Market Transformation through Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling of Appliances" is currently under implementation. The ratings to date have not been good and the mid-term review has not been completed. Before proceeding with a new project in this area, managed in part by UNDP, additional justification will be required.</p> <p>f) Clarified. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, September 2, 2015.</p> <p>b) The program commitment deadline was discussed with the agency and agreed with the program manager. Comment cleared.</p> <p>4) The South Africa child project will not be included in this first PFD submission.</p>	<p>project preparation. It should also be noted that Costa Rica has draft standards for lighting products agreed to at the regional level through the Central American Integration System. The child project will support the implementation of the standards.</p> <p>4) South Africa – The project size is justified due to South Africa large energy consumption, the ongoing energy crisis, the commitment the government of South Africa has placed on energy issues and also the use of investments in the child project. These are described in further detail below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy efficiency gains are required for South Africa to meet its growing energy demand that is needed to continue economic development; - Similarly, South Africa is undergoing a severe energy crisis, including electricity shortages, blackouts, and expected increases in tariffs; - The government has committed high importance on solving this problem through demand side management programs, including energy efficiency of end-use products; - The child project also includes investments that require large funding amounts, such as financial mechanisms and loans to utilities at low interest rates. The project will build on the previous GEF/UNDP project to establish standards and labels by extending the lighting scope to LEDs and distribution transformers – both of which are not included in the previous UNDP/GEF project. Expanding the scope of MEPS to LEDs is necessary in order to ensure poor performing products do not hinder consumer confidence. During project
--	--	--	--

		<p>This will allow more time for the GEFSEC and the agency to ensure full understanding with the South African government.</p>	<p>preparation, the project will fully consider the lessons learned and recommendations for the ongoing. Further, the proposed child project does not limit itself to standards and labels, it expands on the previous project to include financial mechanisms, market surveillance, and environmentally sound management. Regarding whether LED street lighting investment is sustainable and replicable, the project will implement both regulatory mechanisms offering long-term sustainability and also include financial mechanisms providing incentive for municipalities to transform their street lighting. The financial mechanisms will be replicable, as they will show municipalities that they can reduce costs over the lifetime of the product by implementing LED lamps, providing increased confidence of private sector companies and financial institutions to invest in such investments. The project will also integrate a public and private ESCO, which would be sustainable beyond project completion. The project will make specific linkages with India's Energy Efficiency Services Limited (EESL) in order to implement a similar ESCO in South Africa.</p> <p>f) Thank you for spotting this mistake. The number of countries should have stated 15 instead of 14. It has been updated in the attached PFD (Section 4 Benefits).</p> <p>The project will support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100 "countries" with remote support (best practice guides, webinars, call-in center) (global funding) - 15 "non national-child project countries" with training (global funding) - 10 "national child project countries" with
--	--	--	--

			<p>training (global funding) - 10 "national child project countries" implementation (national star allocation) Additional text has been added and an update has been made in the graphic. Both can be found in Part II – Section 1.</p> <p>UNEP response to August 28, 2015 comments 4) The South Africa child project has been removed from this submission and will be resubmitted to the next work program. UNEP, UNDP and DBSA have all agreed on this. This revised South Africa child project, when resubmitted, will reflect that the UNDP-GEF project –Market Transformation through Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling of Appliances in South Africa' (GEF Project ID: 2692) has completed the mid-term review in June 2015. Additionally, the updated child project concept will make additional justification to address any concerns related to the previous reviews.</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 31, 2015. Not at this time. Please respond to the following comments: a) Please clarify the amount of support identified in the components is provided by the global services versus the child projects. Given that additional child projects are being pursued and could be added at a later date, would the funding for each component have to change? Presently, it appears that component 1 is all for Costa Rica, the first child project; and that components 2 and 3 are for global services (called global child project). Consider restructuring to allow</p>	<p>UNEP Response to March 31, 2015 a) The Child Projects would allow for the development of particular aspects of the integrated policy approach in the country, for example developing minimum energy performance standards or developing surveillance capacities (such as a testing laboratory). While the country support, under Component 2, would provide increased capacities for policymakers and the development of technical resources to assist countries in implementing projects and initiatives to transition their markets. For example, Component 2 could train policymakers on market surveillance</p>

		<p>global services to be delivered under one specific component.</p> <p>b) Please describe the criteria for allocation of "support to partner countries" in component 2. See related question in box 8.</p> <p>c) please describe the rationale for component 3. Is this related to project #5831, Establishing the Foundations of a Global Partnership to Accelerate the Market Transformation for Efficient Appliances and Equipment? Why is this program proposing to use additional resources in the amount of \$500,000 to enhance the number of countries participating in another project? The explanation in Table B does not align with the text.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015.</p> <p>a) The global support are in components 2 and 3 and will not change. As additional child projects are added, if any, this will adjust component 1 based on STAR allocation funding. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Criteria are well documented. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) The response documents how this program will work in tandem with project #5831 to build on the global work of that project and to expand the number of countries joining the initiative. The long-term goal is to have 100 countries make a commitment to accelerate use of energy efficiency appliances. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>activities, however it would not provide support to developing the infrastructure in the country.</p> <p>If additional child projects are added to the Program, only the funding for Component 1 would change. Under component 2, if 15 countries are supported ‘ the Program could support additional countries with an increase in funding.</p> <p>Each of the Global Leapfrogging Program's components has been added to deliver a different and precise outcome, which is better reflected in the new graphic. Further, clarification is found below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component 3 of the Global Leapfrogging Program: extends the outreach to countries, resulting in an additional 70 countries joining the partnership and consensus achieved in different regions. - Component 2 of the Global Leapfrogging Program: supports the partner countries (100) through the virtual Centre Excellence and resources in-depth policy guidance. Further, the component also supports select countries (15) with capacity building to carryout projects that promote energy efficient appliances and equipment. - Component 1 of the Global Leapfrogging Program, accommodates the STAR allocation of country to be utilize to advance their market to energy efficient lighting, appliances, and equipment. <p>b) The criteria to receive this support will be based on the country being a partner to the initiative, commitment to advance energy efficiency is shown through national communications; funding for project implementation is available (for example</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>from a child project, other GEF Projects and other sources of funding, including domestic funding, Germany's International Climate Initiative, European Commission); regional diversity of countries supported.</p> <p>This criteria has been added in the text describing Component 2.</p> <p>c) Yes, Component 3 is related to the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831), it results in additional countries joining the partnership from 30 (Project #5831) to 100 under the Global LeapFrogging Program. Component 3, we will utilize the resources developed under the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831), such as country assessments and policy guides on best practice policies, in order to gain the political commitment from countries. The additional funding is requested to develop regional reports and carryout workshops. This approach follows the path of en.lighten, which also hosted four regional workshops, which contributed to 66 countries committing to phase-out incandescent lamps.</p> <p>The text describing Component 2 has been updated to align with the Table B.</p>
	4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DER, March 31, 2015. 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 31, 2015. Yes.	

	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	DER, March 31, 2015. Not applicable.	
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>DER, March 31, 2015.</p> <p>a) The program is supposed to be coordinated with UNEP #5831, Establishing the Foundations of a Global Partnership to Accelerate the Market Transformation for Efficient Appliances and Equipment. However, the coordination is not fully explicated. Please describe, using a flow chart or graph if needed, where the coverage of Global Partnership project and how that differs from the coverage of the global services portion of this proposed project.</p> <p>b) Please explain and describe the GHG benefits calculations of #5831 and compared that to the GHG benefits estimates for this proposed program. There is lots of detail in the program proposal, but a simple table would be appreciated.</p> <p>c) In Table C, a significant amount of co-financing is identified. However, it appears that much of the co-financing is already counted under project 5831. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015.</p> <p>a) Thank you for the helpful graphics in Figure 1, Annex 1 and Annex 2. The wording in Annex 1 is somewhat confusing as compared to the PFD text. For example, the PFD text and response say "15 countries" will be supported; yet Annex 1 says "10 countries supported." Another part of Annex 1 says "100 countries" supported and "25 countries"</p>	<p>UNEP Response to March 31, 2015</p> <p>a) Agreed, additional text and flowchart (see Annex I), showing the relation between the Global Leapfrogging Program and the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) has been added to the PFD. The Global Leapfrogging Program builds off the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) by using resources, such as country assessments and best practice policy guides to expand the number of partners from 30 to 100.</p> <p>b) A graphic has been added for greater clarity. See Annex II.</p> <p>This Global Leapfrogging Program (#9083) follows the same approach as SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) to calculate GHG savings potential. In SE4ALL Global Project (#5831), the project expects 30 countries to partner with the initiative. As the countries will be prioritized to maximize the total GHG emission reduction potential, it is expected that the project will reach 66% of the total nonOECD GHG savings potential for the target products. However, the project will not take credit full the 66%, it will take credit for half or 33% of the total non-OECD emission reduction potential. This approach is taken as gaining the political support represents a large amount of the work in a market transformation, however it also requires capacity building and technical support, as is provided in the Global Leapfrogging Program.</p>

		<p>receive training. Table B of component 2 says "15 countries." Please clarify.</p> <p>b) The explanation in Annex II is very helpful and explains how the GHG emissions benefits are attributed to these closely linked projects #5831 and program #9083. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) The co-financing in program #9083 is above and beyond the co-financing in project #5831. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, August 28, 2015.</p> <p>a) The number of countries was clarified throughout. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>In Global Leapfrogging Program (#9083), the project will follow this same approach under its Component 3, which will result in an additional 70 countries joining the initiative, accounting for the remaining 34% of the non-OECD GHG emissions reduction potential. Again the project will not account for the full 34%, it will account for 17% for getting the countries' political commitment. Therefore between, the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) and the Global Leapfrogging Program's (#9083) Component 3, 50% of the total non-OECD savings potential will be accounted for as they have gained the political commitment of national decision makers.</p> <p>Component 2 of the Global Leapfrogging Program #9083 provides technical how to guides, a virtual centre of excellence, and training of national officials. This component ensures countries are ready to implement projects to transform their market. For this, the project will account for 17% of total non-OECD savings potential.</p> <p>Given that Component 3 gets countries on board and Component 2 increases the capacity of countries to carryout the project, a causality factor of 15% has been used to bring the savings into a reasonable range. The accounted for savings are 372,697,852 tCO₂ for component 2 and 183,502,897 for component 3. Combined with the national child projects savings of 15,718,553 tCO₂, the total project savings will be 571,919,302 tCO₂.</p> <p>A more detailed assessment on the potential GHG savings potential will be conducted at CEO endorsement for both the global</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>components and the individual national projects.</p> <p>Component 1 of the Global Leapfrogging Program (#9083) is the national child project implementation, which will use an integrated policy approach, including minimum energy performance standards, to successfully and permanently transform the market to energy efficient lighting, appliances, and equipment. For this, it is reasonable that the Child project will account for 33% of the total potential for that specific country. The Global Leapfrogging Program will only allocate the savings potential for the countries that sign. For example, currently only the savings for Costa Rica are allocated under the Global Leapfrogging Program.</p> <p>c) Many of the same co-financiers of the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831) are also included under the Global Leapfrogging Program, however this additional financing, not double counted financing. The commitment from the project partners is large, however it should also be noted the long Program timeframe of 66 months. Additionally, the Global Leapfrogging Program will include national activities, thus allow the project partners to deliver different types of co-financing than under SE4ALL Global Project (#5831).</p> <p>UNEP response to August 11, 2015 comments</p> <p>a) The text and Figure 1 in Annex I and in the PFD have been updated to reflect this more clearly. The program will provide different levels of support to the countries. The support is provided as follows:</p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100 "countries" receive remote support (best practice guides, webinars, call-center) (global funding) - 15 "non national-child project" countries receive training (global funding) - 10 "national-child project" countries receive training. This is more detailed in the PFD
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>DER, March 31, 2015. Not at this time.</p> <p>a) More explanation is needed to better understand how the global functions and services proposed under this program will be delivered to participating child projects.</p> <p>b) Please explain the prioritization of providing services to the participating countries.</p> <p>c) Please explain if services delivered are proportional to need, proportional to child project STAR funding, or based on some other criteria.</p> <p>d) Please explain if related GEF projects, that are not official child projects, can avail themselves of the global services.</p> <p>e) Please explain how the program will coordinate with UNDP # 9081 in Turkey.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015.</p> <p>a) Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) Comment cleared. Please ensure that Turkey receives all appropriate support from the global support component.</p>	<p>UNEP Response to March 31, 2015.</p> <p>a) Agreed, additional text has been added in the PFD and is described here: Component 2 will make available best practice 'how to' guides on the successful market transition and remote support through a virtual Centre of Excellence. Further, the global services of Component 2 will provide training for country officials so that they have the necessary capacities to implement the child projects.</p> <p>b) The project will prioritize support based on the potential GHG reduction while also taking into consideration the countries capacities and ambition to carryout the project. A list of prioritized countries will be developed under the SE4ALL Global Project (#5831), which will prepare country assessments showing the savings potential of each country and for the four products (refrigerators, air conditioners, electric motors, and distribution transformers).</p> <p>c) The Child Projects will be developed based on the need and ambitions of the country, however also on the amount of STAR allocation remaining for the country. The country support provided under Component 2 will be based on the need of the country and on the potential for reduction of GHG emissions. The Program may allocate additional resources in larger markets due to</p>

			<p>their increased complexity and to achieve the high GHG emission reductions.</p> <p>d) Yes, the support provided under Component 2 will be available to countries that do not have child projects and it does not require the countries to be implementing a GEF project on energy efficient lighting, appliances, or equipment. For example, (as is described in the text for Component 2), the supported countries could be implementing projects from other funders (for example domestic funding, Germany's International Climate Initiative, European Commission).</p> <p>e) UNEP and UNDP have communicated on the collaboration between the Turkey Project #9081 on energy efficiency of the electric motors and the Global Leapfrogging Program (#9083). It has been agreed while the Turkey project would fit under the programmatic approach and its criteria, the project will not officially be included under it. However, the Turkey project will be eligible and will benefit from receiving support of the Programmatic approaches' global services. Key areas of support are the technical policy guides on motors and training of government officials.</p> <p>UNEP response to August 11, 2015 comments</p> <p>e) Confirmed. The Turkey GEF/UNDP national project will receive the same global support from this program as does any child project, such as access to the virtual Center of Excellence and the training.</p> <p>UNEP response to August 28, 2015 comments</p>
--	--	--	--

			After discussion with the GEFSEC, the following updates have been made: 1) Update of Programme Commitment Deadline of PFD to April 2019 2) Removal of the South Africa child project from this submission. As is stated in the response above, the South Africa child project will be revised and re-submitted in the next work program.
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	DER, March 31, 2015. More detail is needed. Please clarify. DER, August 11, 2015. Comment cleared.	Agreed, a more detailed M&E plan has been added to Section 6.
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	DER, March 31, 2015. Yes.	
Resource Availability	11. 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? 	<p>DER, March 31, 2015. This program proposes to use STAR allocation from Costa Rica. The amount is available.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015. The following letters of endorsement have been received:</p> <p>Costa Rica: For UNEP: \$2,244,750 total, including project of \$2,000,000, PPG of 50,000, and fee of \$194,750. Signed on Feb 27, 2015 by Ruben Robles. At the present time, Costa Rica has over \$13 million in its STAR allocation, but only \$1,995,350 in its CCM focal area allocation.</p> <p>Kazakhstan: For UNDP: \$3,924,000</p>	<p>UNEP response to August 11, 2015 comments</p> <p>a) This is within DBSA cap and total grant ceiling. Please refer to the DBSA Project Agency Certification Template annexed.</p> <p>b) The South Africa project should be one child project with joint implementation. This has been corrected in Annex A of the PFD.</p>

	<p>total, including project of \$3,500,000, PPG of \$100,000, and fee of \$324,000. Signed on July 15, 2015 by T. Akhsambiyev. At the present time, Kazakhstan has over \$10 million in its CCM focal area allocation.</p> <p>South Africa: For UNDP: \$5,559,000 total, including project of \$5,000,000, PPG of \$100,000, and fee of \$459,000. For DBSA: \$5,559,000 total, including project of \$5,000,000, PPG of \$100,000, and fee of \$459,000. Signed on July 28, 2015 by Zaheer Fakir. Total LOE is \$11,118,000. At the present time, South Africa, has \$12.7 million in its CCM focal area allocation.</p> <p>Sudan: \$2,016,500 total, including project of \$1,770,000, PPG of \$80,000, and fee of \$166,600. Signed on June 28, 2015 by Dr. Babiker Ibrahim. At the present time, Sudan has \$5.7 million in its CCM focal area allocation.</p> <p>Please address the following comment:</p> <p>a) With DBSA designated to receive \$5,559,000 for its portion of the child project in South Africa, please confirm that as a newly accredited agency, DBSA has sufficient cap remaining in its per project grant and total grant ceilings to manage this project.</p> <p>b) Please confirm if the South Africa is two child projects as noted in the PFD Annex A or one child project with join implementation as noted in the child project concept note.</p> <p>c) Please ensure that the Annex for new agencies is filled in and submitted by</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>DBSA.</p> <p>DER, August 28, 2015. a) Comment cleared. b) Comment cleared. c) Comment cleared.</p>	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER, March 31, 2015. Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	DER, March 31, 2015. This program proposes to use CC global regional set-aside. The amount is available.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
PFD Clearance	Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?	<p>DER, March 31, 2015. Not at this time. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>DER, August 11, 2015. Please address remaining comments in boxes 2 (b); 2 (c); and 2 (1-5); 7(a), 11 (a) and 11 (b).</p> <p>DER, August 28, 2015. Most of the comments have been cleared. However, a significant issue related to one of the child projects may prevent the full program from being ready for technical clearance at this time. Further, the proposed closing date for the PFD of June 2018 needs discussion. A discussion with the agency and GEFSEC is recommended.</p> <p>DER, September 2, 2015. Agency and GEFSEC discussion held. The program PFD has been revised and submitted with three child projects. The proposed</p>	

		completion date has been discussed and agreed to allow for a balance between accepting willing countries into the program no later than October 2017. Comments cleared; all child projects will be submitted for CEO endorsement by April 2019. The program manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date (s)	Review*	March 31, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 28, 2015	

* 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.