



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

GEF ID:	5299		
Country/Region:	Bolivia		
Project Title:	Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CHEM-3; CCM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$22,830	Project Grant:	\$3,059,361
Co-financing:	\$12,075,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,157,191
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Edu Hassing

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, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. Mr. Juan Pablo Cardozo Arnez, the GEF Operational Focal Point, signed the letter on September 13, 2012.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The amount endorsed for the project, including PPG and fee, is \$3,325,000 There is insufficient CC focal area	

*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)
		allocation remaining.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	DER, February 12, 2013. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	DER, February 12, 2013. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	DER, February 12, 2013. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	DER, February 12, 2013. NA	
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>	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The project is appropriately identified as a combination of CCM-1, CCM-2, and CHEM3 for a strategic planning element on mercury.	
	<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>	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes	
	<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>	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The country wishes to implement policies and regulations to phase out inefficient lighting, but will be unable to proceed efficiently without assistance from the GEF project.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The project will help enforce compliance with minimum energy performance standards that will help phase out inefficient lighting and will establish testing and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		capacity to enforce the standards sustainably.	
	8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The activities are consistent with the en.lighten guidelines, developed with international support, that will provide improved effectiveness, reduce barriers to introduction of efficient lighting, and improve compliance and enforcement while providing global environmental benefits.	
	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 public participation , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	11. 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, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects ,	DER, February 12, 2013. The approach for providing integrated technical	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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 sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 	<p>assistance from the Global Centers is innovative and should provide efficiency in the delivery of global quality policy guidance. The emphasis on development and enforcement of regulatory frameworks for minimum energy performance standards for lighting will contribute to sustainability and will lay the foundation for scaling to all lighting products in the country.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. 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?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>DER, February 12, 2013. Yes.</p>	
	<p>17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing?</p>	<p>DER, February 12, 2013. In order to increase co-financing ratio, agency is requested to pursue additional partners during project design.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes.	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	DER, February 12, 2013. No non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The PIF is technically cleared and may be considered in a future work program. As a PPG is proposed, please consider implementing the PPG in such a way as to be quick and low-cost, as significant foundations for the project have been established through enlighten.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1) Please clarify by CEO endorsement if a facility for MVE will be created, as this may consume more of the resources. 2) Please provide precise description of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>how the global technical assistance support will be integrated with local technical support and monitored carefully for transparency and accountability, especially as the center may be supporting multiple countries simultaneously.</p> <p>3) Please consider the use of lighting quality labels, especially for LEDs, modeled after similar approaches in the U.S. and EU (e.g., LED Lighting Facts)</p> <p>4) Please identify the large-scale LED demonstration program, and if possible, sustainable funding strategies.</p> <p>5) Please pursue additional sources of co-financing.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	DER, February 12, 2013. PPG of \$25,000 including fee is within the approved ceiling and is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.	
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 11, 2013	
	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.**