



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

GEF ID:	5555		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Local Development and Promotion of LED Technologies for Advanced General Lighting		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5193 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,517,400
Co-financing:	\$6,629,394	Total Project Cost:	\$8,146,794
PIF Approval:	October 22, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	

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 8/20/2013 Yes.	MY 12/17/2014: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MY 8/20/2013 Yes. The operational focal point endorsed: PPG: \$89,906 Project: \$1,517,400 Fees: \$152,694 Total: \$1,760,000	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	MY 8/20/2013 Yes. Total STAR allocation: \$27,510,000. As of 8/20/2013, STAR resource remainder: \$6,063,624	MY 12/17/2014: Yes, as in the PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	MY 8/20/2013 Yes. STAR allocation in the Climate Change Mitigation (CCM): \$13,890,000. As of 8/20/2013, the remainder in the CCM: \$3,231,940, sufficient to cover the budget of the current project.	MY 12/17/2014: Yes, as in the PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	MY 8/20/2013 Not Applicable.	MY 12/17/2014: Not Applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MY 8/20/2013 Not Applicable.	MY 12/17/2014: Not Applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	MY 8/20/2013 Not Applicable.	MY 12/17/2014: Not Applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	MY 8/20/2013 Not Applicable.	MY 12/17/2014: Not Applicable.
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	MY 8/20/2013 Yes, with CCM-1: Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies.	MY 12/17/2014: Yes, the same as in the PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>MY 8/20/2013 Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Not at this time.</p> <p>Vietnam completed its second national communications (NC) on December 7, 2010. Please justify how this project is consistent with the NC. Please also assess if this project is consistent with other climate change policies and strategies.</p> <p>MY 1/21/2015: Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>MY 8/20/2013 Not at this time.</p> <p>First, the "important barriers" presented in paragraph 3 on page 3 are not consistent with the "expected outcomes" of Component 1 that are listed at the second last paragraph on page 5. For example, issues of quality LED lamps and consumer confidence were not listed as barriers, while Component 1 on page 5 is addressing these issues. Furthermore, lack of appropriate R&D facilities on LED lighting technologies was listed as a major barrier to the development of LED technologies in Vietnam. However, the project design does not have much to do with removing this barrier. Please consider revising it.</p> <p>Second, Component 2 on page 6 states</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes. For an MSP project, the baseline scenario description on pages 4 and 5 is OK.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the following: "Up until now, there have not been any large-scale indoor or outdoor LED lighting systems demonstrated and evaluated in Vietnam, except MOIT's small project demonstrating 500 LED lamps...." and "Under this (project) component, the following incremental activities will be carried out: (i) develop LED demonstration projects including 1,000 lamps for indoor lighting and 200 lamps for outdoor lighting to demonstrate...."</p> <p>The numbers of 500 and 1200 (1000+200) are in the same magnitude. It is not convincing that the number of 500 is too small and 1200 is enough to have significantly enhanced demonstration effects. Please stress what the MOIT's demonstration project did not accomplish and what this project's demonstration will accomplish.</p> <p>Third, on page 6, the PIF states: "This component will showcase the many benefits of LED lighting.... , can continue to operate for more than 50,000 hours...."</p> <p>The implementation period of the project is 48 month, or 35,000 hours, how can the project show consumers this benefit of long-lasting technology during its 35,000 hours of implementation period? It might be worthwhile to show the life-cycle cost or annualized cost of the LED technology against that of conventional lighting technologies.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>Yes. Issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>Please list the three lighting manufacturers in Table B on page 1. Please consider listing the names of the R&D departments of the three manufacturers as well. During the PPG stage, please identify the gap between the MOIT's demonstration project and this project, and justify why there is a need to demonstrate again LED lighting in Vietnam through this project. Please put the justification in Table B.</p> <p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>Yes. Issues were cleared.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Not at this time. Expected FA outcomes and outputs in Item 1.3 in Table B do not need to be shown. By nature, this project will save energy and mitigate GHGs. Please delete Item 1.3 and reallocate its budget to Items 1 and 2.</p> <p>MY 1/21/2015: Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Initially estimated. Detailed analysis is needed in PPG.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes. Information for (a) and (b) is on page 7 and 5.</p>
	<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>		<p>MY 12/17/2014: Not at this time. Please describe how this project will benefit women if relevant, and how women will contribute to GHG emission reductions via this project.</p> <p>MY 1/21/2015:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Not completed at this time.</p> <p>Please indicate if this project is relevant to issues of gender and indigenous peoples.</p> <p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Issues were addressed and cleared in the Agency's responses to the GEFSEC comments.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p> <p>Yes, as in the PIF.</p>
	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)	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p> <p>Yes. A new risk item was taken into account in the CEO endorsement request.</p>
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Not completed at this time.</p> <p>Innovation: LED technology is under development in Vietnam. The country needs GEF's support in policy, regulation, capacity</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p> <p>Not at this time. On page 37, please add one paragraph to describe how and why this project is innovative.</p> <p>MY 1/21/2015:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>building, and technology transfer to commercialize the technology.</p> <p>Sustainability (not at this time): Please stress how the private sector or the LED users will continue invest in LED technology or buy LED lamps during and after the project implementation.</p> <p>Scaling-up (not at this time): Please stress how the outputs or outcomes of this project will be duplicated or enlarged in a larger scope, or in other sectors or in other areas.</p> <p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.</p>	<p>Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes. For an MSP, it is OK (on page 7).</p>
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes.</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes, but the co-financing should be confirmed by the individual contributors at the CEO endorsement stage.</p>	<p>Not at this time. The Agency needs to bring \$100,00 cash co-financing to this project as it pledged at the PIF stage. MY 1/21/2015: Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013 Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes.</p>
	<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>	<p>MY 8/20/2013 Yes. A PPG is requested, and the requested amount is normal.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes. On page 11.</p>
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013 There is not any non-grant instrument in the project.</p>	<p>MY 12/17/2014: There is not any non-grant instrument in the project.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>MY 12/17/2014: Yes.</p>
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>MY 12/17/2014: Not at this time. Please put M&E information on page 7 in the CEO approval request. MY 1/21/2015: Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>Please address comments in Boxes: 6, 7, 10, and 13.</p> <p>In addition, the topic sentence of paragraph three on page 3 (The deployment ... in Vietnam) does not fit the rest of the paragraph. It is suggested that the Agency write a separate paragraph to support the topic sentence.</p> <p>The first paragraph on page 5 is misleading. Please write the title of the UNEP-GEF project, and use past tense in sentences to describe the UNEP-GEF project.</p> <p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>All issues were addressed and cleared.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>MY 8/20/2013</p> <p>Global environment benefits need to be calculated. Detailed analysis is needed in PPG. See comments in Box 8.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>MY 10/15/2013</p> <p>In the new version of the PIF, Table 1 shows life time energy savings with an LED (20W) lamp against a T8 (36W) lamp. With the information, it is not difficult to further calculate GHG emission reductions from the project.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<p>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		<p>MY 12/17/2014:</p> <p>Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 5, 7, 9, 13, 17, and 22.</p> <p>MY 1/21/2015:</p> <p>All issues were cleared.</p>
	First review*	August 20, 2013	December 17, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 15, 2013	January 21, 2015
	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.**