



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5150		
Country/Region:	Chile		
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; CCM-1; CCM-2; CHEM-3; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,485,713
Co-financing:	\$9,791,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,276,713
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, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. Ximena George-Nascimento endorsed the project on September 12, 2012, in the amount of \$2,696,900 including \$25,000 PPG, \$2,429,000 project and \$242,900 fee.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER, September 28, 2012. No non-grant instrument.	

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. The approach for providing integrated technical assistance from the Global Centers is innovative and should provide efficiency in the delivery of global quality policy guidance. At CEO endorsement we expect a precise description of how the global technical assistance support will be integrated with local technical support and monitored carefully for transparency and accountability.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. There is sufficient CC focal area allocation remaining including the pending projects from other agencies.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	DER, September 28, 2012. NA
	• focal area set-aside?	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	DER, September 28, 2012. This project is identified as CCM-1, Technology Transfer. However, many of the project components are more properly classified under CCM-2, Energy Efficiency. We recommend that both focal area objectives be identified for the project. Furthermore, it is possible to also reference the focal area objectives for chemicals, specifically mercury	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(CHEM3). It may be a useful to consider how a small demonstration of the handling and management of used mercury containing blubs can be done in this project that is consistent with the mercury strategy in GEF 5.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. The project design has been changed to reflect CCM-2 and CHEM3. A strategic planning element under CHEM3 is very innovative for this type of project. Comment cleared.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. Yes, however, only for CCM-1. We recommend that CCM-2 objectives be identified and added to Table A. Consider classifying project components as follows:</p> <p>Strengthening MVE capacities: CCM-2 Environmentally sound management: CCM1 or CHEM3 Lighting innovation: CCM-1</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. The focal area objectives have been modified. However, the approved language for FA outcomes and outputs does not match the GEF template. The third CCM-1 row is not correct and cannot be used. This row should be folded into the second CCM-1 row. The CHEM3 row should reflect the appropriate outcomes/outputs from the GEF Template Reference guide 9-14-2010. Please clarify.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DER, February 12, 2013. Comment cleared.	
	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?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. The project will help enforce compliance with minimum energy performance standards that will help phase out inefficient lighting and will establish testing and capacity to enforce the standards sustainably.	
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, September 28, 2012. 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.	
	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, September 28, 2012. 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.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	DER, September 28, 2012. The description is sound and the project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>components are designed in a coordinated manner. Please address the following comments.</p> <p>Component 1. No comments.</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>a) Please consider the application of CHEM3 focal area objectives related to the handling of mercury and how that can be clearly articulated within component 2 and documented at project completion for dissemination. We would expect no more than \$50,000 of funding requested from the CHEM3 focal area set-aside for this sub-component.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>b) please split this component into TA and INV activities, with an estimated budget for each delineated in Table B. With this significant GEF investment, we would expect a large-scale demonstration program under component 3.1.4 that should be identified at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>c) In addition to demonstrating LED systems, it would be valuable to demonstrate the business model for LED lighting systems that takes advantage of low maintenance, durability, and controls. Please consider during project design if project activities could create sustainable funding models for LED system replacement, such as ESCO funding for outdoor lighting replacement funded by the energy</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>savings.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013.</p> <p>a) Component added. comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Table B has been modified to show how the GEF grant is allocated between the TA and INV components. However, it is not clear how the co-financing will be allocated. Please update that during project design.</p> <p>c) Comment cleared.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. Please address these comments.</p> <p>a) Reporting of the full potential benefits numbers cited in Section B.1 from the en.lighten estimate is helpful information, but this does not clearly link with the project activities. Please describe how the project activities will generate some of the potential benefits during and after the project, and provide rough quantity estimates.</p> <p>At the time of CEO endorsement, it will be necessary to use full phase-out estimate as the top-down indirect benefits that would occur many years after the project is completed. We also request you create a direct estimate number for the demonstration component, and a direct and post-project direct estimate for phase out of inefficient lighting, using the new STAP designed methodology for energy efficiency which includes modules that apply for this type of project.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a) The revised estimates on page 10 of the PIF attempts to explain that a fraction of the 1.2 Mt CO₂e annual emission reduction would be obtained through the project. However, the numbers for annual savings and the cumulative savings don't add up. At PIF stage, we just need a simple explanation of the potential of this project to capture a certain fraction of the potential savings - please clarify the fraction and the explanation.</p> <p>DER, February 12, 2013. Comment cleared.</p>	
	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, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	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, September 28, 2012. Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. However, there are numerous UNDP and UNEP lighting projects in Latin America that should be coordinated with. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. Comment</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, September 28, 2012. Yes. As discussed in box 5, the approach for providing integrated technical assistance from the Global Centers is innovative and should provide efficiency in the delivery of global quality policy guidance. Please address the comment in box 5 at CEO endorsement.	
	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, September 28, 2012. No. The project management cost for this size of a project should be no more than 5% of the GEF sub-total as shown in Table B. Please reduce the GEF funding amount. DER, February 8, 2013. Comment cleared.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, September 28, 2012. We acknowledge that the co-financing participation by en.lighten private sector partners is impressive in amount and appears to be appropriately allocated to the components. But do not quite understand how the large amount of "in-kind" co-financing matches with the activities described. Please explain how you estimated the "in-kind" contributions for the country and how	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the contributions will be brought to bear in the country. (For example, will experts be traveling to the country and providing on-site support at their own expense as part of the in-kind contribution?)</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. An in-kind estimate was presented. The in-kind contributions will include full-time equivalent salaries and benefits, plus travel contributed by the private sector partners. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. For an energy efficiency lighting project the overall co-financing ratio is not that high. For many lighting projects there is a substantial dissemination element, often funded in partnership with the local utilities. Please address whether additional co-financing might be available.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. Agency will pursue additional partners during project design, but notes that the focus is on policy development.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. We consider the amount provided by UNEP to be quite small relative to the many other co-financing partners. Please address if this can be raised.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. The agency will pursue other donors to help raise co-financing before CEO endorsement, but will keep it's contribution at \$25,000. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DER, February 12, 2013. After further consultation, the agency raised its co-financing to \$100,000. Comment cleared.	
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, September 28, 2012. NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	DER, September 28, 2012. NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>DER, September 28, 2012. Not at this time. Please respond to the comments in boxes 7, 8, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26.</p> <p>As a PPG is proposed, please consider designing the PPG in such a way as to be quick and low-cost, as significant foundations for the project have been established through en.lighten.</p> <p>DER, February 8, 2013. Not at this time. Please respond to comments in boxes 8, 15.</p> <p>DER, February 12, 2013. Yes. The project is technically cleared and may be considered in a future work program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO	DER, September 28, 2012.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<p>1) Please clarify by CEO endorsement if a facility for MVE will be created, as this may consume more of the resources.</p> <p>2) Please provide precise description of 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) Clear break down of co-financing for each investment and TA component.</p>	
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*	September 26, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 08, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 12, 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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	DER, February 8, 2013. PPG is within the allowed amount and is technically cleared.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2013
	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.