



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

GEF ID:	4512		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Pilot Asia-Pacific Climate Technology Network and Finance Center		
GEF Agency:	ADB and 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-1; CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-4; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,909,091
Co-financing:	\$74,950,000	Total Project Cost:	\$85,859,091
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Chizuru Aoki/Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Xuedu Lu

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	It is a regional project.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Yes, component 5 has a non-grant instrument. ADB is capable of managing the non-grant instrument. BB, 31/3/2011: For the adaptation components, the SCCF resources will be disbursed as grants.	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	n/a - it is a regional project	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. ADB is leading the investment part, with a higher level of co-financing including equity financing, and UNEP is leading the networking part with sufficient co-financing from donors and self.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

		ADB co-financing is \$67.55 million. UNEP co-financing is \$7.4 million.	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. Both agencies have regional presence and capacity for the project.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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)?	Yes.	
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes.	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, the project is clearly aligned with the CCM focal areas and SCCF results framework.	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	CA, 31/3/2011. Yes, linkages to regional strategies are summarized. National level strategies (such as NCs, TNAs, etc.) are also relevant, and will merit additional analysis for the CEO endorsement once the specific country-level engagements are confirmed. BB 3/31/2011: Yes, the adaptation component will support adaptation technologies as identified by TNAs, NAPAs, and National Communications.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, institutional capacity development through network support is a key component of the project. Outcomes, such as policy integration, mobilized investments and technology transfer will be generated utilizing the capacity developed from the project.	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Section B.1 provides adequate descriptions of the baseline projects for both ADB and UNEP.	

Project Design	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, the baseline projects for both agencies are described and analyzed with sound data.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear at the PIF stage.	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	CA, 31/3/2011. For the GEF TF portion, the incremental reasoning is adequately explained. BB 31/3/2011: for the SCCF portion, the additional cost is adequately justified.	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. As this is a pilot project with the potential for regional replication and complementary national efforts, the two agencies are expected to continue to assess the soundness of global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits generated by the project approach throughout the project.	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	Yes, the cost effectiveness of the combined approach with grant and investments is reflected in the document. Similar to Question 16, the pilot nature of this project does merit concerned efforts to assess its cost effectiveness, so that such information can be utilized to help replicate in other regions and countries, and to help inform the ongoing global dialogue on technology transfer.	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	Yes	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	The descriptions are adequate, with further elaboration and refinement to be expected by the CEO endorsement.	

	20. 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)	One of the key risks identified is the collapse/delays in the ongoing UNFCCC discussions. Please reflect the progress of the negotiations with further analysis for the CEO endorsement, while also recognizing that the project is designed to generate global environmental benefits in line with GEF strategies.	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	Yes.	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes, the stakeholders are identified with their roles. Further streamlining and clarification is requested for the CEO endorsement.	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	This is a first pilot project supported by the GEF and SCCF to generate a practical example of a regional-level climate technology centre and networking. It is important for the project to share its progress and to help coordinate/link related initiatives through its networking functions, which are included in the project design. The project also has a potential to help inform the ongoing discussions on the technology mechanism.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, the PIF describes a clear division of responsibilities between the two agencies, and a specific role for the Steering Committee.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	

Project Financing	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes.	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.		
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CA, 31/3/2011. The GEF TF allocations per objective appear to be adequate to achieve the specified outcomes and outputs. BB 31/3/2011: The resources allocated under the SCCF are adequate.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	The tracking tool has not been used at the PIF stage.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes.	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please consider and address all the points listed above as relevant for the CEO endorsement stage.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 31, 2011	
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

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