



National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Burkina Faso

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10474

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Burkina Faso

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/19/2021

Review completed by PM

10/27/2021

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- The excel sheet with the budget does not include a budget for M&E activities. M&E column in empty. Please update accordingly.

- The excel budget template provided is fine. However, if available the review team will benefit from a more detailed budget which includes a breakdown by outcome (in addition to by component and year). Many GEF agencies require detailed budgets by outcome. If already available within UNDP please attach it to the next submission.

PM 10/11/2021:

No. With many thanks for providing us with the GEF budget template, we kindly ask you to please address the following pending comments:

- The Budget provided in Annex E of the CEO Approval Request (i.e. Portal Entry) is off the cells, which make it difficult to know to which column expenses belong. Please update accordingly.
- The GEF budget does not cover miscellaneous expenses. Please remove them from the GEF template budget.
- Kindly note that an M&E budget is required as per the GEF guidelines (i.e. page 16 - https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf). Under section 9 "Monitoring & Evaluation" of the GEF Approval Document (i.e. Portal Entry) the Agency has identified the GEF M&E costs to be US\$34,000. However, even if the M&E activities are part of Component 4 and have been budgeted under Section 9, the Agency shall fill out the M&E column of the template budget (Annex E), which shall match the total costs identified in Section 9.

PM 10/22/2021:

No. Please address the following pending comments.

- PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10.0%, for a co-financing of \$103,004,451 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$10,000,000 instead of \$1,488,792. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

- The Budget provided in Annex E of the CEO Approval Request (i.e. Portal Entry) is off the margin. Please fix it.

PM 10/29/2021:

No. On the Agency fee: there is a 1 dollar difference between the agency fee stipulated in the PFD (i.e. \$83,211) and the one in the CEO Endorsement (i.e. \$83,210). Please update the agency fee in the CER to \$83,211).

PM 11/03/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

- a) The budget in GEF format (Annex 1 to the project document) does not include a budget in the M&E column because the M&E activities (and corresponding budget) are included in Component 4 of the project (see in particular Output 4.4). A similar approach has been taken in the other AMP child projects.
- b) A detailed budget including breakdown by outcome and output and by year has been provided as Annex 2 to the project document.

Reference:

Prodoc Annex 1

Prodoc Annex 2

Response (18 Oct 2021):

- a) We are facing some challenges uploading the budget in GEF format into the portal. We will attempt to make it more visible but please note that we are also providing the budget in GEF format as separate Word file for your consideration, in case there are still formatting issue with the portal entry. We apologize for the inconvenience.
- b) Miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the budget.
- c) The M&E budget has now been included in a dedicated sub-component within Component 4 in the TBWP, and the M&E column of the GEF template budget has been updated accordingly.

Response (22 Oct 2021):

- a) Thank you for pointing this out. We have revised the co-financing distribution to increase the co-financing contribution to PMC. This contribution is now at USD 9,408,785 (9.9%), so a similar level as the GEF contribution to PMC (10%). The corresponding changes in the CEO ER and project document have been highlighted in blue.

b) We are facing some challenges uploading the budget in GEF format into the portal. We will attempt to make it more visible but please note that we are also providing the budget in GEF format as separate file for your consideration, in case there are still formatting issue with the portal entry. We apologize for the inconvenience.

CO 2/11/2021

Response (02 Nov 2021):

The agency fee in the CEO ER has been updated to USD 83,211.

Reference:

CEO ER Table D

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Under Table C "Sources of co-financing for the Project by name and by type" elaborate further on how any investment mobilized has been identified any changes from the PFD, for instance GCF and WB no longer provide co-financing at CEO

Endorsement stage. "Table 4: Changes in Co-Financing From PIF to PPG Stage" does not include previous co-financing commitments at PFD stage from GCF and WB.

- The African Development Bank co-financing amounts in the project document do not match the amounts in the co-financing letter, neither for the grant nor for the loan. For instance, in the project document the African Development Bank loan is \$5,960,000.00 million while in the co-financing letter is US\$29.7 million. As for the grant, in the project document the African Development Bank is US\$ 16,133,381.00 million while in the co-financing letter is \$983,000. Please clarify and updates as needed.

PM 10/11/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Thank you for elaborating further on the co-financing resources mobilized. However, Under Table C "Sources of co-financing for the Project by name and by type" please add an explanation on how the co-financing resources from the AfDB have been prorated, specifying how you come up with the the final amount for the Burkina Faso project. Similarly to what you have done for the regional/global AMP program.

- Also, the AfDB co-financing letter uploaded for the Burkina Faso is dated on March 31, 2021. However, while reviewing the regional/global program we found out that another version of the AfDB co-financing letter dated on June 16, 2021 was uploaded under for the regional/global project. Specifically, the co-financing amount for "Burkina Faso / Yeleen Solar Programme: Rural Electrification" is USD 29.7 million as per the March 2021 letter but USD 90.5 million as per the June 2021 letter. Please clarify which letter is valid and upload/remove the non-valid ones accordingly.

PM 10/22/2021:

Cleared.

PM 10/29/2021:

No. The co-financing letter from ABER has only been provided in French. Please include a translation to English.

PM 11/03/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

- a) Table C and Table 4 in the CEO ER have been amended to elaborate respectively on how investment mobilized has been identified and to reflect on the changes that took place from the PFD to CEO Endorsement stage. In particular, the WB co-financing did not materialize because the WB could not commit to co-financing off-grid activities at PPG stage. On the other hand, co-financing from the AfDB/GCF Yeleen Project has been accounted for in the co-financing from AfDB.
- b) The AfDB in its co-financing letters proposed co-financing from two projects, specifically: USD 90.6 million as investment (grant, loan and others) from the AfDB/GCF **Burkina Faso / Yeleen Solar Programme: Rural Electrification** to be implemented from 2018-2024 and USD 983,000 (grant) from **Burkina Faso / GMG Support Programme** through AfDB's Sustainable Energy Fund for Africa (SEFA) to be implemented from 2017-2022. Since part of these co-financing sources represent sunk costs, only the budgets related to the period overlapping with the Burkina Faso child project (2021 ? 2025) have been considered as co-financing. This translates to USD 16,133,381 in grant and USD 5,960,000 in loan co-financing.

Reference:

CEO ER Table C and Table 4

Response (18 Oct 2021):

- a) An explanation has been added under Table C in the CEO ER to detail how the co-financing resources from the AfDB have been prorated (see text highlighted in green).
- b) Thank you for pointing out this inconsistency. The updated AfDB co-financing letter dated on June 16, 2021, is the one that should be taken into account for the AMP Burkina Faso child project as well. We have uploaded this letter and removed the previous version.

CO 2/11/2021

Response (02 Nov 2021):

A translated version of the letter to English has been provided with the resubmission.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

No. GHG calculations have been thoroughly described in the agency project document. However, the agency has not provided the GEF team with a calculation spreadsheet to easily trace the calculations. For instance, it is not clear from the text whether the GHG estimated comes from the GEF financing only or from the GEF+co-financing. Please clarify and provide a GHG calculation sheet.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

GHG calculations: A GHG calculation spreadsheet has been included as Annex 18 to the project document (uploaded as separate document).

-

GHG estimates and co-financing: The GHG emissions reductions estimates are based on the total renewable power generation of the greenfield minigrids and the incremental renewable power generation from PUE overlays developed with project support. Project funding (GEF INV) will be used to provide a CAPEX subsidy to cover part (not all) of the capital expenditures required to deploy the minigrid investments. That means that the pilots will require additional contributions to cover the remaining portion of CAPEX costs not covered by project funds, reach financial close and deliver the intended results in terms of GHG emission reductions.

As explained in Annex 13 to the project document, the investment budget (GEF INV + UNDP TRAC) allocated to the Burkina Faso minigrid pilot (USD 677,350) will be used to provide a portion of the pilots' CAPEX needs. The actual level of CAPEX subsidy will be defined during project implementation by the Executing Agency. Nevertheless, and for the purpose of calculating GHG emission reductions from the pilots, a CAPEX subsidy contribution of 46.0% and 51.0% has been estimated for Burkina Faso's greenfield minigrid and PUE overlay pilots respectively to allow the Solar PV minigrids to reach LCOE parity with a diesel-only baseline minigrid.

For clarity, these additional sources of funding for pilots are not included in the CEO ER list of co-financing and accompanied by letters in Annex 14 (apart from the USD 800,000 UNDP TRAC cash co-financing directly contributing to the budget of the project). To identify these co-financiers at the PPG stage would compromise the future competitive tender processes.

Reference:

Prodoc Annex 18

Prodoc Annex 13

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

PM 7/23/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- The two pilots to be developed with GEF funding will introduce productive uses of energy overlays in two solar PV minigrid systems. Please confirm that the project (or at least the GEF-funding) will not be supporting any diesel generation and that the two pilots are entirely run by renewable energy. Are any of the pilots supporting an hybrid

mini-grid? If not, we are wondering whether the overall project document shall state "RE mini-grid" instead of "low-carbon mini-grids". Please clarify and update if applicable.

- Please provide a mechanism to ensure the deployed mini-grid will be used for lifetime (20 years) including governance structure as well as a table explaining ownership and mini-grids operation.

- Please elaborate further on how the project will ensure replacing batteries and converters as well as O&M of the whole system during the lifetime. Please also provide detailed plan to ensure environmentally sound management of such equipment after their usage.

- Figures 1, 2 and 4 are off the margins in the CEO Endorsement document.

- There are a few inconsistencies across the document with the exact activity number for the "Replication Plan". The activity number shall be 4.8, while several sections of the document mistakenly refer to activity 4.7 and output 3.5.

PM 10/11/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Thank you for confirming that the pilot project are not supporting any diesel generation and do not include hybrid mini-grids. Please do check with the global coordinator of the AMP at UNDP since for other national projects "low carbon mini-grids" has been replaced by "RE mini-grids". Please coordinate with the global AMP to keep consistency.

PM 10/22/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

a) We confirm that the pilot projects are not supporting any diesel generation and do not include hybrid mini-grids. The pilot projects consist exclusively of solar PV minigrids with batteries. We have revised the wording in some occurrences in the project document, but kept "low carbon mini-grids" in the results framework for consistency with the other AMP child projects.

b) The mechanism used in the project to ensure that the deployed mini-grid will be used for lifetime (20 years) is to introduce a private sector-led delivery model in collaboration with ABER, and to support productive uses as anchor loads to strengthen the viability and sustainability of the systems. As described further in Output 2.1 (where a table ? Table 4 - has been added as requested by the GEFSEC reviewer), the minigrids will be fully owned and operated by a private sector company. In addition, the selected sites were screened to make sure they are not included in existing plans for grid extension in the near future. Also, the project is introducing containerized minigrid solutions, which can be easily redeployed to other locations if need be. This is important considering the fragile and evolving security situation in Burkina Faso, even though the selected sites are currently not located in instable areas.

c) The tendering process that will be conducted by ABER to select private sector developers/operators for the minigrid pilots will include requirements and criteria related to the replacement of batteries and converters, which will be placed under the responsibility of the companies. These replacements will play a key role in ensuring that the minigrids remain viable and deliver a satisfactory service in the long run, therefore will need to be included in the financial modelling prepared by the companies. The project will seek to support the companies in this planning exercise, for instance by specifying in the contract with the operators/owners of the minigrids an amount to be put aside by the companies in escrow account specifically for replacing components such as batteries and converters. Similarly, companies will be asked to include a product take-back clause in their proposal to support waste management throughout the lifetime of the minigrids. The National Renewable Energy Agency (ANEREEEE), one of the stakeholders involved in the project, is already working on a plan for management of e-waste, which will have to be applied to all rural electrification projects, including AMP. Also, as part of the support from Tony Blair Institute and AfDB's Yeleen Rural Electrification project to the mini-grid sector in Burkina Faso, a mechanism for the management of equipment at the end of their usage is being developed. The AMP project will collaborate with these stakeholders in addition to ABER in the scope of Output 1.1 to develop a guide on e-waste for the minigrid sector. Further details on the assessment and management of environmental risks, including waste, are included in the SESP (Annex 6 to the project document) and ESMF (Annex 10 to the project document). Related text to highlight these aspects has been included in the project document under Output 2.1.

d) Figures 1, 2 and 4 in the CEO ER have been reformatted to fit within the margins of the document.

e) Thank you, corrections have been made in the project document and CEO ER. The Replication Plan is now correctly referred to as Output 4.8.

Reference:

Prodoc Table 4

Prodoc Output 2.1

CEO ER Figures 1, 2 and 4

Response (18 Oct 2021):

After checking with our AMP global coordinator, we have agreed that replacing 'low carbon mini-grids' by 'RE mini-grids' is acceptable and the submission package has been updated accordingly.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes, with further request for clarification. The project document states that "The proposed strategy is squarely aligned with the GEF Strategic Focal Areas CCM-1-1 Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for de-centralized renewable power with energy storage, and CCM-1-3 Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for accelerating energy efficiency adoption". However, the project is requesting funding exclusively from Focal Area CCM-1-1 (see section A Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements), as such please remove any reference to CCM-1-3 to avoid confusion.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

CO_6th October 2021

Thank you for pointing this out. Reference to CCM-1-3 has been removed in the project document.

Reference:

Prodoc Par. 9 and Par. 18

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes, with further request. UNDP ProDoc states that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been provided as a separate document. Please do upload the Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the GEF Operational Portal.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

CO_6th October 2021

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 9 to the project document) has been uploaded as separate document in the GEF Operational Portal.

Reference:

Prodoc Annex 9

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

No. UNDP ProDoc states that the Gender Plan has been provided as a separate document. Please do upload the Gender Plan in the GEF Operational Portal.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

The Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (Annex 11 to the project document) has been uploaded as separate document in the GEF Operational Portal.

Reference:

Prodoc Annex 11

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

No. The proposal is missing both a risk and an opportunity analysis on the COVID-19 impact.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

CO_6th October 2021

A risk and opportunity analysis on the COVID-19 impacts has been added in Paragraphs 64 and 65 in the project document. A COVID-19 related operational risk has also been added in the risk register (see Table 11 and Annex 7 to the project document). Lastly, more elaboration on COVID-19 consideration and opportunities is provided in Annex 19 to the project document.

Reference:

Prodoc Par. 64 and 65, Table 11 and Annex 7

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ThsPM 7/23/2021:

No. Kindly note that as per the GEF jargon, ABER is the executing agency not the implementing partner as described in section 6 "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination". Please update throughout the project proposal to avoid confusion with the implementing agency of the AMP, i.e. UNDP.

Also, we are very happy to see other developing partners (i.e. AfDB, GCF, WB, EU, IRENA, etc.) sitting on the Project Board/Steering Committee of the project, specially given the multiple projects/initiatives of these partners on rural electrification in Burkina Faso. Strong coordination and frequent communication will be key to ensure synergies and avoid potential overlaps. This is relevant for all the project activities, but particularly for activity 3.2. on general market intelligence study on minigrids in regions complementary to WB and AfDB investments.

PM 10/11/2021:

No. Thank you so much for the clarification. We note that the legal term used by UNDP is "Implementing Partner". Since this creates confusion between the Executing and Implementing roles as required by the GEF, our proposal would be to keep "Implementing Partner" in the UNDP ProDoc, and update the GEF CEO Approval Request (i.e. Portal Entry) to reflect that ABER is the Executing Agency and UNDP is the Implementing Agency. This approach would be in line with other national AMP projects.

PM 10/22/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

We note the risk of confusion between the terminology used by the GEF and UNDP. We would like to emphasize that the term "Implementing Partner" is the legal term used by UNDP to describe the national partner in charge of implementing a project under National Implementation Modality (NIM), such as ABER in the AMP child project in Burkina Faso. This term is used in UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP), and throughout the project document template for GEF projects, as well as related documents such as the ICF checklist and Partner Capacity Assessment Tool (PCAT). This is also further explained in Section X (Legal Context) of the project document. Therefore, we would like to keep this term in the project document in order to avoid internal confusion and inconsistencies. This being said, we have indicated in

several instances in the project document (e.g., cover page, project organizational structure, etc.) that the Implementing Partner is equivalent to the 'GEF Executing Agency?' in order to avoid confusion. We hope this approach is acceptable to GEFSEC.

Thank you for the appreciation on the structure of the Project Board/Steering Committee. Indeed, coordination between development partners will be key to the success of this project. Besides the coordination at the project governance level, we also see the national multi-stakeholder platform facilitated in the scope of Output 1.1 as a key mechanism to ensure coordination and communication between relevant stakeholders throughout the project implementation, that will contribute to all the components of the project.

Response (18 Oct 2021):

Thank you, we have updated the package as proposed:

- In the UNDP project document, ABER remains the 'Implementing Partner?;
- In the CEO ER, ABER is the 'Executing Agency?' (and UNDP is the 'Implementing Agency?').

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed 'Knowledge Management Approach?' for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes, with suggestions. Please clarify that the timeline for the knowledge management deliverables is provided in the work plan, given that the deliverables are indeed outputs of Component 4.

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

We kindly refer to the Multi year Work Plan in Annex 4 to the project document, which indeed includes Component 4 on knowledge management and its respective outputs.

Reference:

Prodoc Annex 4

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes. Also, the audit response template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

Agency Response

CO_6th October 2021

Thank you, this is well noted.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

No. Please include a table listing all comments provided by Council at PFD approval stage. For those no relevant to this child project, please clearly indicate so. Council comments are available here:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_C.57_compilation_council_comments.pdf

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

Thank you. A list of responses to Council comments at the PFD stage is now included in Annex B of the CEO ER.

Reference:

CEO ER, Annex B

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021:

No. Please address STAP comments provided at the PFD stage, in particular:

1. The proposal presents an adequate list of stakeholders. However, the diesel generator industry is quite widespread in Africa and the project proponents need to consider how to ensure that they do not hinder project success. The project also need to consider incentives for alternative livelihoods for people involved in diesel generator industry.
2. What are the backups to prevent diesel generators from still being frequently used?

PM 10/11/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
CO_6th October 2021

Thank you. A list of responses to STAP comments at the PFD stage, including the two issues highlighted above, is now included in Annex B of the CEO ER

Reference:

CEO ER, Annex B

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/23/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/23/2021: The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address further comments.

PM 10/11/2021: The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address further comments.

PM 10/22/2021: The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address a comment on PMC proportionality.

PM 10/29/2021: The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address the following minor comments:

- On the Agency fee: there is a 1 dollar difference between the agency fee stipulated in the PFD (i.e. \$83,211) and the one in the CEO Endorsement (i.e. \$83,210). Please update the agency fee in the CER to \$83,211).

- On co-financing: The co-financing letter from ABER has only been provided in French. Please include a translation to English.

PM 11/03/2021:

Cleared.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations