



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

GEF ID:	9742		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Supporting the Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy CLETS		
GEF Agency:	CAF	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,900,000
Co-financing:	\$37,579,820	Total Project Cost:	\$40,479,820
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	RenÃ© GÃ³mez-GarcÃ­a

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV, March 1, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with the Climate Change Objective 2, Program 3: Promote integrated low-emission urban systems.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, March 1, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned to Chile's INDC, which targets an economy-wide target of 30% reduction in 2007 levels of carbon emissions intensity per unit of GDP by 2030. It will support the formalization of the CHilean Low	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Emissions Transport Strategy. It also builds upon the Transport Green Zone in Santiago NAMA.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MGV, March 1, 2017:</p> <p>1. Please define what is considered as integrated zero or low-emissions urban (IZLEU) mobility and why its development is necessary in Chile to attain GHG mitigation reductions, among other co-benefits. This should be informed by the data that has been provided, but needs an additional step in analysis to show a prioritization among the different modes of transport in the chosen localities based on the potential to reduce GHG emissions from the sector.</p> <p>MGV, March 31, 2017:</p> <p>1. Comment cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MGV, March 1, 2017:</p> <p>1. Please clarify how this project builds upon the progress Chile has already made through the Santiago Transportation Green Zone NAMA, and that there is no overlap, in particular with planned actions to be carried out in Santiago.</p> <p>2. The way the project is designed, it is not clear whether the majority of the co-financing will be able to be confirmed by CEO Endorsement, and</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>further it is likely it will come in after the project and thus may not be counted as co-financing. Please document how the project will expect to confirm a large part of the private co-financing at CEO Endorsement, perhaps by focusing on 1-2 tenders that can be awarded during the project period or alternatively by having a selection criteria within the tenders that ensures a certain level of co-financing for it to be awarded. Please also clarify what is meant by "international funding."</p> <p>3. The project seems to prioritize too many types of pilot actions with a small amount of resources. It may be useful to prioritize based on fewer interventions by impact and potential for rapid scaling up and replication.</p> <p>MGV, March 31, 2017:</p> <p>1. Comment cleared.</p> <p>2. Thank you for the added clarifications. It is not quite clear to us which of the project investments will be funded by the public sector, through the cash co-financing listed under the Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications, and which will be funded by the private sector, with an expected amount of 28 million USD (or a mix of the two). It would</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>be useful to clarify the expected financing mechanisms for each of the 7 investments.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, the project will have to submit confirmation letters for the co-financing listed from each of the ministries, in particular, we will be interested in seeing the letter from the Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications for the cash amount of over \$13 million. For the amount listed under the Private Sector, as per the policy, " co-financing that is expected to be secured or mobilized from private sector entities or project beneficiaries during project implementation, but after CEO endorsement, may be counted as confirmed co-financing if the Agency's project document includes clear requirements that such co-financing be mobilized during implementation at a clearly expressed minimum level. Such contributions will often be mobilized during the project implementation through match requirements in the project or similar project design features."</p> <p>3. Comment cleared.</p> <p>MGV, April 10, 2017: All comments cleared.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MGV, March 1, 2017: 1. Please clarify how the GHG emissions reduction was estimated and ensure that it includes a direct and indirect estimate. The total of under 600,000 tCO₂e_q seems low for the project amount and co-financing expected.</p> <p>MGV, March 31, 2017: Comment cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MGV, March 1, 2017: Indigenous people are not affected by this project. 1. Please provide more information on the involvement of CSOs and plan for further analysis of the gender aspect of the interventions, in particular consultations may be needed to ensure uptake of non-motorized transportation pilots.</p> <p>MGV, March 31, 2017: Comment cleared.</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? 	MGV, March 1, 2017: Yes, according to the latest estimates of STAR allocation after the shortfall, Chile has \$12.67 million left to program.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	MGV, March 1, 2017: No. According to the latest estimates of STAR allocation after the shortfall, Chile has a CC allocation left of \$2,693,902,	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>while this project is requesting \$3,270,000. The \$576,098 would have to be taken from the LD or BD allocations. Please confirm this with the OFP.</p> <p>MGV, March 31, 2017: Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>MGV, March 1, 2017: No, please address the comments in Boxes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and also below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please update the co-financing numbers in Table A, Table B and Table C. They all add up to different totals. 2. For a project that is smaller than \$3 million, the recommended PPG amount is \$100,000. Please justify the need for a PPG of \$150,000. <p>MGV, March 31, 2017: Not yet, please address remaining comments below and in Box 4:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not cleared. Table B is still adding to a number different than that presented in Table A and C. Please revise. 2. Not cleared. The PPG amount is determined based on the grant 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>amount, which in this case is below \$3 million. Please re-adjust to allowed \$100,000. In addition, please submit an updated letter of endorsement with the adjusted amounts.</p> <p>3. In the first table on the PIF, the box for Agency Fee should match the amount in Table D (only the Agency fee for the grant not including agency fee for the PPG). Please also fill in the GEF Project ID, 9742, and the Submission Dates. In addition, please complete Part III, including the GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information Template.</p> <p>4. For clarity in resubmissions, it is useful to highlight the changes made to the document so it is easier to find the added text.</p> <p>MGV, April 10, 2017: All comments have been cleared. P.M. recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 10, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
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 monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• 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.