



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

GEF ID:	5518		
Country/Region:	Serbia		
Project Title:	Removing Barriers to Promote and Support Energy Management Information Systems in Municipalities (EMIS) throughout Serbia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4588 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,300,000
Co-financing:	\$19,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,900,000
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Marina Olhanskaya

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 ?	MY 8/12/2013 Yes.	MY 8/12/2013 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MY 8/12/2013 Yes The letter was signed on May 17, 2013. The total endorsed amount for the project was \$2,628,000 including \$100,000 PPG and \$228,000 agency fees.	
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? 	MY 8/12/2013 Yes. As of August 12, 2013, Serbia had a	MY 6/1/2015 Yes.

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		remainder of \$3.42 million STAR resources.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>MY 8/12/2013</p> <p>Possible.</p> <p>As of August 12, 2013, Serbia had a remainder of \$1.24 million CCM resource, but the country is flexible in using STAR resources. This project can be financed using part of BD and LD resources.</p> <p>MY 8/28/2013 Yes, reconfirmed.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not applicable.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not applicable.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not applicable.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not applicable.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.</p>
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>MY 8/12/2013 Yes. It is aligned with CCM-2.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Yes.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	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>MY 8/12/2013 Not clear at this time.</p> <p>On page 6, the PIF states: "While the public sector and municipal buildings present a small percentage of the overall building stock in Serbia, they are among the least efficient of any building category". It seems that this project scope only covers public buildings. If this is correct, please clearly state this scope at the title of the project and in the baseline, and justify why only public buildings are covered in the project.</p> <p>If the project scope covers all buildings, it is necessary to describe what will happen to the private-owned buildings without GEF interventions in the baseline.</p> <p>MY 8/28/2013 Yes, cleared.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not at this time. Please put the budget or cost of M&E in Table B. The project management cost is \$500 more than the cap amount (5% of subtotal). Please cut the amount of \$110,000 by \$500.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not at this time. Please put the budget or cost of M&E in Table B. The project management cost is \$500 more than the cap (5% of subtotal). Please cut the amount of \$110,000 by \$500.</p> <p>MY 6/12/2015 Yes. M&E budget was put in Table B</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			and the project management cost was reduced accordingly.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not clear at this time.</p> <p>The project targeted to retrofit 3000 public buildings with 3000 square meters each. This means that the total targeted floor area is 9 million square meters. The total budget of the project is approximately \$10 million including \$5 million in-kind contribution. On average, one square meter floor area will have less than one dollar cash investment. How this one dollar investment, if without any further investment, can achieve savings from 120 kW to 60 kW per square meter in energy consumption? Please explain it in detail.</p> <p>MY 8/28/2013 Yes, cleared.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes.</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?		<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes. On pages 5 and 6 of the CEO ER document.</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not at this time.</p> <p>In Section A2 (pages 13-14), please indicate if the project is relevant to the private sector (such as owners of private</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		buildings), CSOs and indigenous people. MY 8/28/2013 Yes, cleared.	
	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)	MY 8/12/2013 Yes.	MY 6/1/2015 Yes, on pages 31-33 of the UNDP project document.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	MY 8/12/2013 Not completed. Please indicate in more detail about the "EBRD Regional Energy Efficiency Program in West Balkan -ESCO and Policy Dialogue". When will it be finished? Is it possible to integrate this current project with the EBRD project and extend the scope of this current project to both public and private buildings?	MY 6/1/2015 The Agency indicated that the proposed project is not relevant to any other projects in the country and the region (page 5 of the CEO ER document).
	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 	MY 8/12/2013 Not at this time. The project looks innovative and sustainable. However, the PIF does not address scaling-up. The Agency may consider scaling up the project scope from public buildings to all buildings in Serbia after the project implementation is over. MY 8/28/2013 Yes, cleared.	MY 6/1/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		MY 6/1/2015 Yes. Some minor changes were made during the PPG stage. The changes were reasonable and described on page 5.
	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?		MY 6/1/2015 Yes, on page 36 of the UNDP project document.
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?	MY 8/12/2013 Not clear at this time. First, approximately 50% of the co-financing amount is in-kind contribution. Please consider raising more cash co-financing. Second, investment less than one dollar cash in per square meter of floor area may not be able to achieve the energy saving target: reducing power consumption by 60 kW per square meter. Please also see comments in Box 8. MY 8/28/2013 Yes, cash-financing increased and comments cleared.	MY 6/1/2015 Yes. The total amount of co-financing increased from \$9.3 million at the PIF stage to \$19.6 million at the CEO ER stage. The increased co-financing comes from the KfW (investment capital) and the national government (investment capital).
	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 bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	MY 8/12/2013 Not at this time. Please raise more cash for the project. The Agency may also need to raise more cash co-financing in the project. MY 8/28/2013 Yes, issues cleared by phone calls and	MY 6/1/2015 Not clear at this time. The attached co-financing letters contain one from The Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development; but Table C does not

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		addressed in written responses to comments.	<p>show such a ministry.</p> <p>The co-financing amounts in the letters and in Table C on page 3 of the CEO ER document do not match. Please make them consistent.</p> <p>Please review and get new financing letters if necessary.</p> <p>Please re-submit the co-financing letters (with translation) one by one (not put in one file).</p> <p>MY 6/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were cleared. Additional description on co-financing was added as footnote to Table C on page 4.</p>
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>MY 8/12/2013</p> <p>Not at this time. The total funding level is OK, but the GEFTF PMC should be no more than 5% of the GEFTF subtotal.</p> <p>MY 8/28/2013</p> <p>Yes, the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>Again, the GEFTF PMC is more than 5% of the GEFTF subtotal. Please reduce the amount to 5%.</p> <p>MY 6/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. the GEFTF PMC was reduced.</p>
	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?	<p>MY 8/12/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>MY 6/1/2015</p> <p>Yes, on page 15 of the CEO ER document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	MY 8/12/2013 Not applicable.	MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		MY 6/1/2015 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		MY 6/1/2015 Not completed at this time. Please extract major steps and information from pages 53 and 54 of the UNDP project document, add relevant costs to the steps, present the information and cost in a table, and show the table on page 6 of the CEO ER document. Please also add the cost of M&E in Table B on page 2 of the CEO ER document. MY 6/12/2015 Yes, comments were cleared.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		MY 6/1/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed on page 14 of the CEO ER document.
	• Convention Secretariat?		MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.
	• The Council?		MY 6/1/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed on pages 12-13 of the CEO ER document.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		MY 6/1/2015 Not applicable.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>MY 8/12/2013 Not at this time.</p> <p>Please address comments in Boxes 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, and 18. There are some typos in the PIF. The total requested GEF funding is more than \$2 million. So, this project cannot be processed as an MSP. Please use the correct template and revise the PIF on page 1.</p> <p>MY 8/28/2013 Yes, all issues and comments were cleared.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>MY 6/1/2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 7, 18, and 22.</p> <p>MY 6/12/2015 All comments were addressed and issues were cleared, but the co-financing letter from JICA is missing. An email has been sent to the Agency calling for the letter.</p> <p>MY 6/21/2015. Yes, the missing co-financing letter was submitted on June 17, 2015.</p>
	First review*	August 12, 2013	June 01, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 28, 2013	June 12, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)		June 21, 2015

*** 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.**