



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF Program ID:	4959		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Program Title:	MIF-IDB Public-Private Partnership Platform		
GEF Agency:	IADB	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-2; CCM-3; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$15,000,000
Co-financing:	\$266,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$281,250,000
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Rogério Ramos

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The proposed private sector investment will be in GEF eligible countries.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA. This is a regional program under the GEF-5 private sector set-aside and no OFP endorsement is required.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The IDB has a comparative advantage for application of non-grant instruments and a proven track record of working with private sector partners.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The proposed PPP Program includes non-grant instruments. The IDB has a proven track record of managing such instruments.
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. Supports to clean energy, infrastructure and private-sector development are core pillars of the IDB strategy.
Resource	6. 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? 	DER, April 12, 2012. The STAR allocation does not apply as this program will access the private sector set-aside.

Availability	• the focal area allocation?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• focal area set-aside?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The requested amount is within the remaining balance of the GEF-5 private sector set-aside.
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The PPP Program will address CCM2, Energy Efficiency; CCM-3, Renewable Energy; and BD-2; Mainstreaming Bio-diversity
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	DER, April 12, 2012. Table A is correctly filled out with the appropriate outcomes and outputs.
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The investments in energy efficiency, renewable energy capacity, and bio-diversity are consistent with national strategies and plans in the expected portfolio of countries where the investments will take place.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The use of GEF private sector funding blended at concessional terms with IDB and other donor funding is expected to attract private sector investors to these important projects in Latin America.
Program Design	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The project describes significant interest in environmentally sound projects, yet barriers remain in attracting sufficient private sector investment.
	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The IDB will use GEF funding blended with IDB funding to attract private sector investors with substantial co-financing, yielding approximately 17:1 or more co-financing for every unit of GEF funding requested.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The use of GEF private sector funding blended as equity with IDB and other donor funding is expected to attract private sector investors.
	14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?	DER, April 12, 2012. The description is very helpful. The planned investment in each fund is described, along with a fund description and an indicative pipeline

		of investment projects.
	15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	DER, April 12, 2012. Among the benefits from the investments over the project lifetime will include - At least 3 programs registered under UNFCCC and issuing Certified Emission Reductions - At least 7 million tons CO2-equivalent abated - 100 MW of new renewable energy capacity operational - Up to 1,400 jobs supported - From \$96-\$156 million in revenues generated - An estimated \$17.6 million in taxes contributed - Preserve over 6,000 hectares of land
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes, each of the funds has strong engagement with stakeholders and CSO.
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The program management cost request is zero
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The type of co-financing is appropriate for the type of equity investments.
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The estimated co-financing for each of the investments in the pipeline presents appropriate and adequate levels.
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes. The IDB will bring significant co-financing and will be providing technical assistance for project preparation.
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	DER, April 12, 2012. Tracking tools will be developed for the overall program as investments are identified and funded. GEFSEC will work with the agency to ensure appropriate tracking.

	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	• STAP?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• Council comments?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?	DER, April 12, 2012. NA
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	DER, April 12, 2012. Yes.
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	DER, April 12, 2012. As a PFD submitted for the PPP Program under the GEF-5 private sector set-aside, the documentation included in the PFD will be sufficient for consideration of CEO endorsement if the PFD is approved by Council for inclusion in the Work Program.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 06, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 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 program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	DER, April 12, 2012. No PPG.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PCB/PPG for Program 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.