



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

GEF ID:	4880		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Climate Technology Transfer Mechanisms and Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-1; CCM-2; CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-3; CCM-4; CCM-4; CCM-5; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$11,050,000
Co-financing:	\$63,390,000	Total Project Cost:	\$74,440,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Chizuru Aoki	Agency Contact Person:	Francisco Arango

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: It is a regional project.  CO for CC-A: Yes, Mexico and the rest of the countries in the region are eligible for SCCF-B funding.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: n/a - it is a regional project	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes  CO for CC-A: Yes, IDB has the comparative advantage of engaging the LAC region in this project. As the multilateral development bank of the	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		region, it has significant political and financial presence and has worked extensively on climate change projects.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes, IDB's co-financing includes \$50 MUSD of hard loan. IDB is capable of managing the non-grant instrument.  CO for CC-A: Yes. IDB is a multilateral development bank and can therefore manage hard loans.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes  CO for CC-A: Yes, IDB has sufficient staff capacity in Mexico and the rest of the Latin America region, and the project fits the Agency's program on climate change.	
Resource Availability	6. 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)?	CO for CC-A: Yes, the grant requested is within the resources available under SCCF-B. However the proposal must specify the funding window from which funds are being requested. Recommended Action: Please specify "SCCF-B" grant requested in tables A, B, and D.  April 13, 2012: CO for CC-A: the proposal specifies that funds will be coming from SCCF-B	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		in the text, as the tables do not provide that option in dropdown menus.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: The proposed allocation from the GEF TF regional set aside is above \$10 million. Please adjust to \$10 million agency fees and project management costs included.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes, the project is clearly aligned with the CCM focal areas.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, the project is aligned with CC-A Objective 3: "Promote Transfer and Adoption of Adaptation Technology".</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes. Consistency with LAC TNAs is particularly mentioned.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes. The project is consistent with the region's TNA's; several countries' climate change policies and plans, NAMA's, and National Communications.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes, institutional capacity development through network support is a key	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of project outcomes?	<p>component of the project. Outcomes, such as policy integration of technology transfer, mobilized investments and technology transfer will be generated utilizing the capacity developed from the project and the networking set up by the project.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: The proposal does address sustainability of the project. However, the details on how capacities will be developed in the countries with the help of the network, in order to make the project sustainable Recommended action: By CEO Endorsement, please provide details on the roles of ECLAC and INE in developing the necessary capacities to do so, in the countries in the region.</p>	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: No. Please address the followings: a) Please clarify whether the activities described within the baseline description would have occurred without GEF financing or not. b) Please clarify which barriers to technology transfer would have remained with the baseline activities without GEF involvement.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared. At CEO endorsement stage, please detail what activities will be expanded (and how) or done better because of GEF funding especially for component 3 and 4.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Please explain, in each of the project components description, what activities and outcome will be achieved with GEF funding that would not have occurred without it.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Not clearly. There is no reference as to how SCCF-B resources will contribute to the additional cost of adaptation activities in the center. Recommended Action: Please include a statement clarifying that SCCF-B resources will be used to promote adaptation technology transfer.</p> <p>April 13, 2012: CO for CC-A: Cleared.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared. See Q11.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Please address the following: a) For component 1, the project framework only mentions "strategies or plans development" while the project description page 11 goes further with activities aiming at the development and adoption of policies. Please review the project framework for better</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>consistency.</p> <p>b) For component 3, the project framework mentions "research projects" as output. The GEF does not fund research activities. Please clarify or modify.</p> <p>c) For component 3, the project framework should mention policies and mechanisms to overcome barriers for technology transfer alongside with enabling policies and mechanisms.</p> <p>d) Please explain how the project will assist the small island states of the Caribbean with technology transfer.</p> <p>CO for CC-A:  Not entirely. Outcome 3.3 states that SCCF-B resources will be used for research projects on technology development and transfer. However, stand-alone research projects cannot be financed under SCCF-B.  It is unclear at this stage how the project will support Caribbean countries on technology transfer for adaptation.  Recommended Action: please remove the Output referring to research projects or explain how these projects are related to deployment and/or diffusion of pilot activities. Also, please state how the project will support the Caribbean islands on mitigation/adaptation technology transfer.</p> <p>April 13, 2012:  CO for CC-A: Outcome 3.3 is now part</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of Component 4 and the wording has been changed to reflect that the research will be translated into bankable projects. Since these activities should be counted as investments, they were included in component 4 which deals with mobilization of investments on the development and transfer of EST. The response sheet submitted on April 13, 2012, states that the full project design will include specific criteria to ensure that all groups of countries including the Caribbean islands are represented, achieving regional balance.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: No. the methodology presented for the description of the incremental/additional benefits accounts for the mitigation benefits of all project activities, including activities that are in the baseline. Incremental benefits should only account for activities and outcome achieved with GEF funding that would not have occurred without it. Please revise the proposed methodology.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, applied methodologies and assumptions of additional benefits, regarding adaptation are sound.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Socio-economic benefits are shortly described but none seems linked with gender dimensions.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, the project will strengthen the region's overall competitiveness of local businesses and national economies; will create high-value jobs; and bring benefits in terms of food security (for adaptation).</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: a) The project will try to involve the different stakeholders through its technology networks and centers. However, please clarify how CSOs or indigeneous people will be involved. b) Please consider how the involvement of future technology users could be developed at an early stage to ensure better chances of future technology diffusion.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Not clearly. The proposal mentions partnerships and engagement of public and private institutions, academia, research institutions and business associations. However, there is no mention of the role of CSOs. Recommended Action: please specify consideration of CSOs in the project.</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CO for CC-A: April 13, 2012: the role of CSO's has now been emphasized in the context thematic networks (Component 2).</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>18. 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)</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: No. Please address the following: a) Please present a table of risks with potential impact and mitigation measures for each risk. b) Please take into account the risk of having the proposed technologies not adequately adapted to users' needs and practices.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Coordination with other related activities is acceptable at this stage. However, the details of other initiatives in the region that deal with issues related with climate technology transfer and how the project will coordinate with them will have to be stated in the CEO endorsement request.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Please address the following: a) Please clarify the human resources ECLAC may provide as executive agency to the proper implementation of the project. b) Please explain how ECLAC will interact with the other project institutions (IDB, INE)</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes. Project management cost represents 5% of GEF funding.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, 5% of the sub-total project cost will be will be financed by the GEFTF.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Please address the following:</p> <p>a) The amount devoted to technical assistance in component 1 is quite important (5.2 MUSD). Please justify.</p> <p>b) The amount devoted to technical assistance in component 3 is very high especially for co-financing (14.4 MUSD). Please justify.</p> <p>c) If part of this co-financing is to be devoted to investments, please make two different rows (one for technical assistance and one for investment) with the associated outcomes and outputs. Take into account that feasibility studies to prepare for investments should be counted as investments.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Yes, co-financing is being contributed by IADB in the form of grant and hard</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		loans; by bilateral aid agencies in the form of grant; and ECLAC, INE, and GoM in-kind.  CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: The cofinancing ratio is 1:5. However GEF TF funding needs to be downscaled to 10 MUSD (see Q6).  CO for CC-A: Co-financing is appropriate. However, final amounts will be detailed during CEO Endorsement.  CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: Yes. The IDB brings 58 MUSD of co-financing, including 50 MUSD of hard loan.  CO for CC-A: Yes, IADB is a multilateral bank and therefore hard loans and grants are appropriate with its role.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>CCM - FJ March 28, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. The proposal should be discussed with the GEFSEC before resubmission.</p> <p>CO for CC-A: Not at this stage. Please address comments in Sections 6, 13, and 14.</p> <p>CO for CC-A April 13, 2012: Yes.</p> <p>CCM - FJ Apr 13, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need 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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.