



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

GEF ID:	5530		
Country/Region:	Russian Federation		
Project Title:	Green Shipping Programme for Russia		
GEF Agency:	EBRD	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-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$10,000,000
Co-financing:	\$104,040,000	Total Project Cost:	\$114,240,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Gianpiero Nacci

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, August 15, 2013: No. Please submit an endorsement letter signed by the Operational Focal Point. HT, August 30, 2013: Yes, the endorsement letter has been submitted. Comment cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	HT, August 15, 2013: The GEF-5 CCM remaining resources for Russian Federation are below the amount the current proposal is requesting, when	

		<p>consideration. Therefore, reallocation of resources should be decided by the Operational Focal Point (OFP) to request the amount in the current proposal. Please discuss this with the OFP.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: Reallocation of resources has been decided by the OFP, reducing the GEF funding for another project. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: Please address the above comment.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N?A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: Energy efficiency improvement of shipping is categorized into CCM-4 (sustainable transport), rather than CCM-2. Therefore, please revise Table A (Indicative Focal Area Strategy Framework) with the descriptions in B.2.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: Table A has been revised. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: Please explain that the project has relevance to the UNFCCC National Communication submitted by the Russian Federation in 2010.</p>	

		<p>Relevance to the National Communication has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>HT, August 15, 2013: Not clear. Are the baseline projects the IMO's Energy Efficiency Design Index and a set of measures enacted by Rosmorport (federal State Unitary Enterprise for marine transport infrastructure)? Please articulate the baseline projects.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: The IMO's Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI) has been identified as the baseline project. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) Please articulate what the Green Shipping Programme is. b) Please articulate the scope of the project. Does the project target replacement of aging vessels in addition to retrofitting existing ones? Please explain. c) The proposal identifies split economic incentives as one of the barriers. How will this barrier be removed by project activities? Please explain. d) Is the Ministry of Economic Development appropriate to execute the project? Does the Ministry cover the maritime policy? Please justify the executing partner.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: a) The Green Shipping Programme has been articulated. Comment cleared. b) The scope of the project has been articulated. Comment cleared. c) Explanation has been provided.</p>	

		d) The revised PIF identifies EBRD as the executing agency. Comment cleared.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: a) Please explain how to estimate bunker fuel reduction and GHG savings. b) Incremental cost reasoning will be reviewed after other comments are addressed.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. Please provide detailed estimation of direct and indirect GHG emission reductions and cost-effectiveness by the CEO Endorsement stage. b) Yes, incremental cost reasoning is sound and appropriate.</p>	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes. In particular, the private sector is the important partner of the project.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes.	

	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	HT, August 15, 2013: After the completion of the project (GEF grant and EBRD loan), how will the investment in green shipping be sustained? Please explain. HT, August 30, 2013: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. The project is innovative in addressing GHG emissions from the maritime sector. The project outcomes and outputs will be sustained through the technology platform established in the project and demonstration of energy efficient technologies.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency	HT, August 15, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) In Table C, does the "Investment" by EBRD (\$100 million) mean loans?	

	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	in Table C. b) Given the nature of the project, is it possible to seek co-financing by the national government? Please explain. HT, August 30, 2013: a) EBRD's co-financing has been clarified. Comment cleared. b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, August 15, 2013: The PIF proposed to cover project management cost by co-financing.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes, PPG is requested, which is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	HT, August 15, 2013: Yes, there is a non-grant instrument. The PIF proposes to consider financing options during project preparation. By the CEO Endorsement stage, please provide a reasonable calendar of reflows.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, August 15, 2013: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments. In particular, please contact the Operational Focal Point and submit an endorsement letter.</p> <p>HT, August 30, 2013: All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, August 30, 2013: Please address the following items at the CEO Endorsement stage:</p> <p>a) detailed estimation of direct and indirect GHG emission reductions and cost-effectiveness;</p> <p>b) project implementation/execution arrangement, including coordination with the national government and GEF/IMO national focal points;</p> <p>c) a reasonable calendar of non-grant reflows.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 15, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	
	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.**