



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9081		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	Promoting Energy-Efficient Motors in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5285 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,750,000
Co-financing:	\$26,350,000	Total Project Cost:	\$30,200,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	John O'Brien

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MO March 23, 2015 Yes.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO March 23, 2015 Yes. 5th National Communication of Turkey placed priority on energy efficiency technology and pilot solution. Turkey has also developed Energy Efficiency Law, Energy Efficiency Strategy Plan and Energy Efficacy Improvement Program. However current regulation is applicable only to new electric motors and exclude non-efficient motors in use. MO March 27, 2015 Please submit Operational Focal Point endorsement letter.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global	MO March 23, 2015

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Electric motors are recognized as one of the largest and cost saving potentials of any GHG mitigation, but the replacement or re-manufacturing of existing motors often require significant capital investment.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MO March 23, 2015 Yes.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?	<p>MO March 23, 2015</p> <p>Component 4 Please clarify whether Component 4 targets SME as end user or SME as manufacturer, or both. The paragraph 17 describes that the proposed project targets both, but the paragraph 32 proposes the financial mechanism support end users to purchase and install EE motors. Please provide output 4.3 in the paragraph 31.</p> <p>Component 5 Outcome 5.1 in Table B does not match the discussion in the paragraph 34-36. This component should focus manufacturers, industry and general public, and training of laboratory staff will be implemented under component 3. Please revise Table B.</p> <p>The number of conversion of motors to IE2, etc., in the paragraph 17 is different from in the paragraph 43. Please revise.</p> <p>Please look at the project review and STAP comments on Energy Efficiency (EE) motors project in China (GEF ID 5630), and consider possible activities, for example to review global policies and international standard IEC 60034-30 in the Component 1, and demonstration of the high benefit investment in EE motors in Component 5.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>According to the 2014 Project Implementation Review of EE in industry in Turkey (ID 3747), the rating was unsatisfactory, and the "studies for auditing, database and benchmarking are still pending". Because the proposed project will implement energy audit under Component 4, please review and revise risks and mitigation actions based on the experiences of on-going projects.</p> <p>MO March 27, 2015 Comments cleared</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MO March 23, 2015 Please describe socio-economic aspect. Currently only gender element is considered.</p>
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	<p>MO March 23, 2015 Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MO March 23, 2015 Not at this time. Please address the comments.</p> <p>MO March 27, 2015 After receiving the endorsement letter, PIF will be technically cleared.</p> <p>MO March 31, 2015 The endorsement letter was submitted. PIF is technically cleared.</p>
Review Date	Review	March 23, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.