



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

GEF ID:	4956		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Regional Climate Technology Transfer Center		
GEF Agency:	EBRD	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-2; CCM-2; CCM-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,909,092
Co-financing:	\$75,990,000	Total Project Cost:	\$86,899,092
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Gianpiero Nacci

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?	<p>CCM/FJ â€œ Apr 10, 2012: Please consider indicating in part A2 that the EBRD countries that will not be beneficiaries of this project may voluntarily take part in the network and, as such, take part in North-South cooperation.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, the proposal states that SCCF-B will only fund non-Annex I country parties to the UNFCCC. The proposal also recognizes that some EBRD countries may overlap with countries benefited by the CTCN in Asia (ADB) and the CTCN proposed in</p>	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Africa (AfDB) and has proposed coordinating with these agencies to avoid duplication of efforts in these countries. CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012/CC-A: 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 Apr 10, 2012: Yes CC-A: Yes, EBRD is the regional development bank for the Eastern European and Central Asia countries. It has significant presence in the region and has already performed investments in technology transfer.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: Yes, component 3 involves a hard loan instrument. EBRD is capable of managing the non-grant instrument. CC-A: Yes, EBRD is a multilateral development bank and therefore able to manage the hard loans indicated for co-financing.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012/CC-A:Yes	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012:Yes	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	CC-A: Yes, however, it is necessary to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?	be precise throughout the text in the proposal to clarify that funds are being requested from SCCF-B (as opposed to SCCF-A, or simply SCCF).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012:Yes	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	CC-A: Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: No. Please address the following:</p> <p>a) The third outcome of component 2 is not a valid outcome under GEF-5. Please refer to the GEF-5 template reference guide (http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624).</p> <p>b) Focal area objective CCM-3 is mentioned in the text but not in table A. Please adjust the inconsistency and see Q14.</p> <p>CC-A: The proposal is consistent with CC-A Objective 3: Promotion and adoption of adaptation technologies.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</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 Apr 10, 2012:</p> <p>a) In part A2 please consider rephrasing the last paragraph as follow: "The EBRD will further detail its analysis of the National Communications and TNAs of the participating countries and this will be used to inform the development of the full project presented for CEO Endorsement".</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) Please make clear reference to the UNFCCC decisions made in COP16 on technology transfer (Decision 1/CP.16, established a Technology Mechanism that consists of a Technology Executive Committee and a Climate Technology Centre and Network with their respective functions).</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: Yes, the policy related capacity development through network support is a key component of the project that will strongly interact with the investment component and associated technical assistance. However the project should better underline how the non policy related capacity building will be strengthened through the project (see Q14)</p> <p>CC-A:</p> <p>a) Same comment as CCM – the project description needs to articulate how non policy related capacity building will be strengthened through the project.</p> <p>RA: please address.</p> <p>b) Some elements in the proposal suggest that sustainability will be ensured. For example, on Component 2, the technical assistance provided for the development of the financial mechanism will consider sustainability. However, it necessary to elaborate on how capacity</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>building through the project will be directly linked to its sustainability.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, please elaborate on how the project is planning to ensure capacity building and how this will be linked to the project's sustainability.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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>	<p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please include in the baseline description part B1, some elements of rationale that support the proposed implementation of networking activities. This is missing.</p> <p>b) Please consider mentioning the activities of the EBRD's Sustainable Energy Financing Facility and their relevance to the project.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes. Regarding investments, EBRD has specified that the SEI Phase 3 will be taken into account as a project baseline, upon which adaptation activities will be executed. SEI 3 will build incrementally on the structure of SEI 2 (a 4,000 million euro initiative). For this phase, climate change will be considered and it is proposed that there is an increased emphasis on adaptation.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared. Details will be needed at CEO endorsement stage regarding what the use of GEF funding enables to achieve with the proposed financing</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		mechanisms as compared to what EBRD would have been able to achieve on its own.	
	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 Apr 10, 2012: Some elements of what would happen without GEF funding are provided in the last paragraph of B1 but need to be strengthened: a) Please transfer this paragraph to part B2. b) Please explain which of the identified barriers the EBRD baseline activities would have been unable to lift without GEF funding (and why) and which barriers will be targeted thanks to GEF funding (and how the GEF funding will enable to overcome these barriers). c) In the last sentence of the mentioned paragraph, please clarify with what the associated technical assistance is associated.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, the proposal states that for adaptation, SCCF-B funds will build on the baseline to yield adaptation benefits by providing technical assistance related to identifying and implementing adaptation technology investments.</p> <p>CCM/FJ+CC-A - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared. Details will be needed at CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>endorsement stage regarding how the use of GEF and SCCF funding enables to achieve incremental and additional benefits, respectively, as compared to what the baseline EBRD activities would have been able to achieve on their own.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please underline better that the objectives of the networking activities are not solely focused on policy issues but also on technologies and technology transfer.</p> <p>b) Please consider setting up an anchor somewhere in the region for The network component (preferably not in London). The agency can propose to have a process to identify a suitable anchor/organization with whom they will collaborate on the network portion and allocate more resources for that purpose.</p> <p>c) Please use one row for each outcome in table A with the associated outputs and financing figures.</p> <p>d) Please also number the different outcomes and outputs for easier reference.</p> <p>e) The project is too focused on energy efficiency for a project that is supposed to aim at climate change technology transfer and networking. Please expand at least to CCM-3 and CCM-4 in table A and in the rest of the document.</p> <p>f) Please clarify that the network component will address sectors outside energy efficiency (including LULUCF,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>transport, etc.). Please also mention in Annex A that not only additional technologies will be identified but also additional focal areas and sectors.</p> <p>g) Please consider expanding the second outcome of component 1 in order to include the removal of barriers in policies/regulations that are limiting climate technology transfer.</p> <p>h) The GEF cannot fund activities under component 2 that would be similar to the country level technology needs assessments (TNAs) that the GEF is already funding following the UNFCCC guidance. Please clarify or revise component 2 to avoid such duplication.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, the project framework is sufficiently clear. However, by CEO Endorsements, further clarifications are needed, especially on Component 3.</p> <p>Recommended Action: by CEO Endorsement, please elaborate on the design of the financial mechanism and the viability of the financing products listed in this proposal. Please specify how these products will be implemented and if these apply to both adaptation and mitigation. Also, please note that the listed financing products do not target the urban water sector. This sector has been identified by EBRD as the sector with higher adaptation potential.</p> <p>Therefore, it is necessary to state clear linkages between the proposed financing instruments and the urban water sector.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>CCM/FJ â€™ Apr 10, 2012: The methodology and assumptions are clear but the overall efficiency (\$10/tCO2eq) seems low especially for energy efficiency. Please justify.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, the methodology and assumptions for adaptation are appropriate. For adaptation, EBRD recognizes its comparative advantage in the urban water sector. It also recognizes that in Central Asia and the Caucasus, water scarcity is a climate change-induced problem and that there is a significant potential for improving municipal water supply through innovative investments. Therefore, the adaptation activities of the project will focus on the water efficiency including eligible climate resilient technologies.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</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>CCM/FJ â€™ Apr 10, 2012: Yes</p> <p>CC-A: yes, socio-economic benefits that are related to adaptation activities are in the form of water savings in consumption, which is particularly important in areas where water customers experience supply problems. The project will also support job creation, and women are considered in the proposal as direct beneficiaries, as they are usually directly impacted by the ease of access to household water for domestic use.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ â€™ Apr 10, 2012: a) Please underline better that the sectoral and technological project scope will be broader than the examples provided in the document in order to attract participation of others than the policy makers, financial institutions and industrial sector stakeholders. b) Please underline the involvement of future technology users in part B5. c) Please detail in part B2, component1, page 10 under "design and conduct regional tech transferâ€™" the other relevant stakeholders that will be involved.</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, public participation includes NGO's, public institutions, research institutions, universities, and private sector. All of these institutions will play a role in the project's Network.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 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 â€™ Apr 10, 2012: Please modify in part B4 the "stakeholder participation" risk into a risk of "low uptake by users for climate technologies".</p> <p>CC-A: yes, the project has taken into account some risks and has suggested mitigation activities for them. However, a major risk for this project that is not considered is the lack of regional cooperation, especially in Central Asia and the Caucasus.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Endorsement, please explain how EBRD plans to mitigate the risk of lack of regional cooperation, especially while trying to promote a strong network.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 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 Apr 10, 2012: Please use the proper project title in reference to the regional AfDB project: "Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network".</p> <p>CC-A: Yes, the project will coordinate efforts and explore synergies with AfDB and ADB to avoid duplication with their respective CTCN's in overlapping countries. Coordination will also be ensured with UNDP, UNEP, and the UNFCCC, during project preparation and implementation. Recommended Action: by CEO Endorsement, please clarify how the project will be coordinated with existing investments in the region that promote technology transfer.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: Please briefly clarify the implementation/ execution arrangement of the project.</p> <p>CC-A: Project implementation arrangements are adequate for this stage.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: No management cost is required by EBRD. CC-A: Yes, PMC will be covered by project's co-financing.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: The budget allocated to networking activities appears small when compared to similar regional initiatives funded by the GEF (50% smaller at least). Please justify. CC-A: Yes. CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: The proposed co-financing for GEF TF activities is 1:7	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: Yes. EBRD is bringing close to \$76 million of co-financing including \$70 million as hard loan. CC-A: Yes, EBRD is contributing \$70M in hard loans.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: n.a.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	CCM - FJ Apr 10, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2012: At CEO endorsement stage, details will be needed regarding a) What the use of GEF funding enables to achieve with the proposed financing mechanisms as compared to what EBRD would have been able to achieve on its own. b) How the use of GEF funding enables to achieve incremental benefits as compared to what the baseline EBRD activities would have been able to achieve on their own. c) The sectors and countries on which each component will focus, along with a rationale for this choice. d) The financial mechanisms to be developed by the project along with a demonstration of their incrementality compared to the baseline activities.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CC-A: Please see comments under Q10, Q13, Q14, Q18, Q19.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 16, 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	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.