



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9332		
Country/Region:	Kazakhstan		
Project Title:	Energy Efficient Standards, Certification, and Labeling for Appliances and Equipment		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5703 (UNDP)
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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,500,000
Co-financing:	\$12,242,643	Total Project Cost:	\$15,842,643
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Marcel Alers

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes. Minor changes in wording were justified. Objectives were clarified.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes, STAR resources were set-aside at the time of PFD approval. However, the parent project was approved with a smaller agency fee of \$315,000. The child project requested for (\$3,500,000) and Fee (\$332,500). The parent has only \$3,500,000 and fee \$315,000 available. Therefore, the PIF needs to be revised to the lower level of \$315,000 and re-submitted. The letter of endorsement from the OFP in July 2015 was appropriate at the time of PFD approval and does not need to be revised.	
	4. Does the project 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, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	• STAP	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	• GEF Council	DER, April 25, 2017. Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	DER, April 25, 2017. Not at this time. The parent project was approved with a smaller agency fee of \$315,000. The child project requested for (\$3,500,000) and Fee (\$332,500). The parent has only \$3,500,000 and fee \$315,000 available. Therefore, the	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>PIF needs to be revised to the lower level of \$315,000 and re-submitted.</p> <p>DER, May 4, 2017. The PIF was revised as requested. All comments cleared. The program manager recommends CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 25, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 04, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		