



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

GEF ID:	4957		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Small and Medium Enterprise Energy Efficiency Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	131398 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$252,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$256,500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Angela Armstrong,

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?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, April 10, 2012. Endorsement letter not included. Please supply. DER, April 26, 2012. Letter supplied. The OFP, Dr. Akca, signed an endorsement letter in the amount of \$3,640,000 and agency fee of \$360,000 for a total endorsement of \$4,000,000. Comment cleared.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, April 10, 2012. 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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER, April 10, 2012. Non-grant instruments are included as options for the investment component. The Agency is capable of managing it.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes. The request of \$4,400,000 is within the remaining CCM allocation including other pending projects. DER, April 26, 2012. The request is lowered to \$4,000,000 which is within the remaining CCM allocation.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	DER, April 10, 2012. NA
	• focal area set-aside?	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	DER, April 10, 2012. The project proposes to address CCM2, Energy Efficiency.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DER, April 10, 2012. a) Please clarify how the Table A allocation of funding matches with Table B. Specifically, please clarify why \$350,000 is recorded for outcome 2.1 but \$850,000 is listed under component 2 in Table B. Please adjust Table A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>numbers as appropriate.</p> <p>b) For the Investment component, the proposed description includes non-grant options for the GEF portion, but appears to include the option that reflows would be used for TA. Please keep investment and TA separate and dedicate reflows for additional investment. Also please clarify if any of the GEF investment funding will reflow back to the GEF Trust fund at the end of the project.</p> <p>c) Please also confirm that risk protection will be for the local banks investments not for the World Bank loan.</p> <p>DER, April 26, 2012.</p> <p>a) Table A has been adjusted. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The investment portion has been delineated. The revised PIF confirms that GEF funding will defray risks for local banks and that reflows from the GEF funding will support additional investment. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) The risk protection is for the local financial institutions. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<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>	<p>DER, April 10, 2012. Yes, however, please address whether the proposal conforms with Turkey's National Communications.</p> <p>DER, April 26, 2012. This project on energy efficiency is consistent with the NC1 submitted by Turkey on 20 February 2007 and documented in FCCC/IDR.1/TUR. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
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?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	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?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes. Emissions reductions are estimated to be 684,000 tons CO2e annually.	
	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?	DER, April 10, 2012. Gender benefits are not described. Please supply.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, April 10, 2012. Not clear. Please clarify. DER, April 26, 2012. The World Bank will work closely with GDRE and private financial institutions to implement the project. At CEO endorsement please provide a more developed description of the executing agency relationships.	
	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?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes. The amount requested is less than 5% of the GEF requested amount.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	DER, April 10, 2012. Co-financing is excellent.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	confirmed co-financing is provided.		
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	DER, April 10, 2012. Yes.	
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?	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	DER, April 10, 2012. NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	DER, April 10, 2012. Not at this time. Please respond to comments in boxes: 8, 9, 16, and 20. DER, April 26, 2012. Yes. All comments cleared.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER, April 26, 2012. At CEO endorsement please provide a more developed description of the executing agency relationships.	
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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 26, 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.