

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS<sup>1</sup>

Country/Region: Morocco

Project Title: Morocco: Market Transformation for Energy Efficient Lighting in Morocco

GEFSEC Project ID: **4139**

GEF Agency Project ID:

GEF Agency: UNEP

GEF Focal Area (s): Climate Change

GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): CC-1;

Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0      GEF Project Allocation:\$889,091      Co-financing:\$3,915,909      Total Project Cost:\$4,805,000

PIF Approval Date:      Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:

Program Manager: Alexis Jean-Roch Mariani

GEF Agency Contact Person: Edu Hassing

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion <sup>2</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, by letter on April 15th	
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	CC-1	
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	Yes - link to the global project "Global Market Transformation for EE lighting".	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	Yes	
	• The focal areas?	Yes. Morocco : Climate Change allocation \$4,500,000, utilization \$400,000, pipeline \$3,003,000, Available \$1,097,000	
	• Strategic objectives?	na	

<sup>1</sup> Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

<sup>2</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic program?</li> </ul>	na	
Project Design	7. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Could you please justify the estimations you provide :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- page 8, where does the figure of 40% switch of Moroccan households to EE lighting products ? Is it a realistic figure compared to what we know from the most advanced countries using EE products ?</li> <li>- page 11, where does the figure of 15% energy savings related to lighting come from ?</li> <li>- How do you calculate 2MtCO2 emissions reductions from these figures ?</li> </ul> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	<p>Yes, the project is OK and very interesting. But the project has clearly not been enough prepared with regards to its concrete execution on the ground, and many points have to be clarified or elaborated at the PIF stage to avoid any risk of misconception at the CEO endorsement stage :</p> <p>1. Component 1. What concrete outputs do you expect from this component ? The description page 6 does not match with the description in the project framework. In particular, the output "adoption of new regulations" seems critical and does not seem to be properly addressed in the activities.</p> <p>2. Component 2. Could you elaborate on the activities linked to the enforcement of the standards. The cost of this component seems really too low to hope to have a concrete enforcement. For example, why don't you include in the scope of the project the</p>	

implementation of the testing procedures ?  
There seems to be a risk here.

3. Component 3. I would appreciate to have, in the PIF, the whole picture of the CFL plan of Morocco. It seems that the plan is to distribute 22M CFL, that the scope of this GEF project is limited to 10M CFL, and that OSRAM could provide 5M CFL in addition. Could you please explain how all these pieces are linked together ? Please clarify if the project will replace 10 or 22 M CFL and correct the PIF as appropriate.

With regards to the activities described page 7, they are very vague and should be more specific :

- why do you keep awareness raising here (page 7) whereas there is a specific component on this issue ? In the framework you mention awareness raising of distributors / suppliers whereas page 7 you mention awareness raising of customers.
- Will the costumers pay for their CFL ? How could you get 10M CFL (whose individual price is at best \$0.85 / CFL) through a component whose cost is 3.3 M ? At some places you speak about financial incentives to customers, elsewhere about distribution of CFL.
- Who will do what ? Who will do the bulk procurement ? Who will do the distribution ?
- you speak about a CFL recycling scheme, what will be done, by who ?
- Do you plan to claim for carbon credits ?
- How is it that the price obtained from OSRAM (described page 9) is \$1.5/ CFL ?

What is concretely the support of the global efficient lighting project to this national

		<p>project ?</p> <p>4. In comparison with the other components, the costs of components 5+6 is huge. This project is an MSP and the cost of this 2 components should not consume 17% of the total GEF amount. Moreover, it seems that the moroccan institutions, which have been strenghtened lastly, are totally able to execute and monitor the project themselves. It would then be appreciated that the MEMWE have the full responsibility of components 5 and 6.</p> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	<p>Yes, but please give the whole picture of the moroccan CFL plan and explain the coordination of the actions.</p> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
	11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes, but please give the whole picture of the moroccan CFL plan and explain the coordination of the actions.</p> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
	12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	<p>Please see comments on GEB</p> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
	13. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		
	15. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	<p>Please consider the risks of non-enforcement of the standards.</p> <p>12-17-2009- cleared</p>	
Justification for GEF Grant	16. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental	The incremental reasoning has to be strenghtened. Given the plan of the government to distribute 22 CFL, what is	

	reasoning?	exactly the baseline here ? What is exactly the incrementality of GEF support ?	
		12-17-2009- cleared	
	17.Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	Yes	
	18.How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		
	19.Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	It is high if we consider also the M&E component.	
	20.Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		
	21.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	Yes	
	22.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		
	23.Has the Tracking Tool <sup>3</sup> been included with information for all relevant indicators?		
24.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?			
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
<b>Secretariat Decisions</b>			
	<b>25. Is PIF clearance being</b>	Could you please address the comments above	

<sup>3</sup> At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

Recommendations at PIF	<b>recommended?</b>	?	
	26. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	12-17-2009- PIF recommended by project manager for work program inclusion	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	<b>27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?</b>		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review		
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review		
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review		

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	Yes
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	Yes
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	12-17-2009- PIF recommended by project manager for work program inclusion. If the project is included in the next WP, the PPG will be submitted for approval.
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	

wb21049  
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM