



Benin National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10831

Countries

Benin

Project Name

Benin National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids Program

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/18/2022

Review completed by PM

12/9/2022

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

12/8/2022 PM:

Cleared.

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes, with request for clarification. Since outcome 2.1. has been included under Technical Assistance, shouldn't the narrative be pilots structured/designed instead of developing? Developing and commissioning of pilots shall be tagged as investment. Please clarify and/or updated as need be.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JB:

We understand your point. We have made a distinction between the pilot preparation phase (2.1, TA) and activities related to investment in goods and works (2.2, INV). The term 'project development' is common language referring to the preparation phase of infrastructural works, real estate, energy plants, etc. It involves conceptual design, negotiations, planning and permitting, finance, up to the point of procurement of goods and works. We have made an edit to the title of output 2.1, inserting the text '(preparatory phase)' to capture this.

Action taken:

Title of output 2.1 edited throughout.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

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

12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/16/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- UNDP \$200,000 co-financing: change ?Grant? to ?In-kind?
- Ministry of Energy:
 - i. change ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?
 - ii. provide a brief summary under Investment Mobilized description section

10/7/2022 PM:

No. Although co-financing sources, amount and type have been adequately documented, please elaborate further on **how "Investment Mobilized" was identified and explain main changes from PIF/PFD. Particularly, since that co-financing amount has been significantly reduced from PIF/PFD to CEO Endorsement stage, i.e. from 58.3 million to \$33.2 million .**

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JB:

At the PIF stage, co-financing was indicative. The large majority of indicative PIF co-financing was from the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) USD 55m, together with a smaller SEforAll component USD 3m. Subsequent consultations at the PPG stage with both the Benin MCA team and the SEforAll teams determined that this co-financing had already been expended in 2021 and 2022, and therefore these co-financing amounts were removed.

At the PPG stage, additional consultations identified new sources of co-financing, aligned in timing and substance with the AMP Benin project's activities. The Ministry of Energy's USD 21m contribution relates to ABERME's off-grid public investments. AfDB confirmed the Rural Electrification Project will run into 2023, enabling the project team to add a portion of this as a source of Investment Mobilized (representing roughly one fifth of the duration of the overall AfDB project), given opportunities for synergies on rural energy access investment at the start of the AMP Benin project.

Action taken:

Explanatory text on changes inserted into CEO ER (Part II ? Changes)

20/12/2022 JB

The Ministry of Energy's co-financing has been adjusted and the Investment Mobilized description updated in Section C of the CEO ER.

UNDP's contribution has been kept as ?Grant?. This is grant (cash) co-financing and is not in-kind.

**Cf. CEO ER Section C*

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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

Yes. All PPG resources have been either spent or committed.

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

12/8/2022 PM:

Cleared.

10/7/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Please submit a spreadsheet/document explaining how the emission reductions have been calculated, including a reference to all the assumptions made, to help the review team track the calculations and ensure consistency in the final numbers.
- Emissions reductions are reported under Indicator 6.1. Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU Sector. This is not correct. The emission reductions shall be reported under Indicator 6.2. Emissions avoided outside AFOLU. Please fix.
- Please provide an explanation on the main differences in the total number of beneficiaries PIF/PDF stage and CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

Regarding the first comment/question:

The supporting annex was not shared together with the CEO Endorsement Request. We apologize for this oversight.

This is now included and responds to the first and third questions above:

- Benin - CCM Annex - Project GHG ER and other targets (2022 09 16)?, corresponding to Annex 22 in the project documents, which details the project's GHG Emissions Reductions and Project's target contributions to GEF-7 Core Indicators

Regarding the second comment/question: this appears to have been a copy-paste mistake. Will be adjusted in portal at resubmission.

Regarding the third comment/question: the differences are explained in the attached Annex, section H4 Differences with respect to PIF Targets?.

Specifically with regard to beneficiaries, please see the following text in the Project GHG ER Annex (now attached) ? People served per kW of installed capacity. Assumptions on the number of people served by each minigrad have been revised downward with respect to PIF stage. At PIF phase each of the project's minigrad systems was assumed to have 10 kW of installed solar capacity and serve a population of 100 households or 500 people per minigrad. This resulted in an implicit assumption at PIF phase of 50 people served per kW of installed capacity. At CEO ER stage, the assumption is that each greenfield minigrad will serve 10 people per kW of installed capacity while the PUE Overlay minigrads will serve 3.4.?

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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
12/8/2022 PM:

Cleared.

10/7/2022 PM:

No. In the CEO Endorsement please elaborate further on the business models for the existing mini-grids in Benin. Are the public, utility-owned? Who is the operator, the owner of the assets? This information is critical to understand what it is working and what is not in the existing mini-grids.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

We have addressed this comment by providing additional information in the CEO ER. Note that, in the case of Benin, the MG delivery model is covered in national law, specifically defining the issues highlighted in your comment (asset ownership, public/private concessionaire). Among other support, the role of the AMP is to assist GOB to update specific regulation (bylaws, decrees, model contracts) and monitor effectiveness thereof. As during the next years a large number of MGs are expected to become operational in Benin, it is key for GOB and its partners to learn and amend processes and regulation if necessary.

Action taken:

Text in the CEO ER has been expanded.

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

12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/8/2022 PM:

No. Please note the following comments haven't been addressed:

1) From the proposed alternative scenario description, it is not clear how many and what type of pilots are expected to be implemented, i.e. greenfield, hybrid, etc. Please clarify whether this has been identified at PPG stage. If not, please explain why. If yes, please provide further description on the selected options. Section 6 on Global Environmental Benefits states that approximately 2,400 connections are expected. However, this shall be further further explained in the CEO Endorsement.

2) In case the project is supporting extension of existing diesel grids, i.e. hybrid mini-grids, please explain this further in the CEO Endorsement and make explicit that the GEF funding will never be used to finance interventions to grids where the diesel capacity is increased, and in no cases GEF funding would ever be invested in fossil fuel power generation assets. If hybrid mini-grids are not supported by the project, then we suggest to modify the objective of the project as well as the narrative of the document to replace low-carbon mini-grids by renewable energy mini-grids.

10/7/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- From the proposed alternative scenario description, it is not clear how many and what type of pilots are expected to be implemented, i.e. greenfield, hybrid, etc. Please clarify whether this has been identified at PPG stage. If not, please explain why. If yes, please provide further description on the selected options. Section 6 on Global Environmental Benefits states that approximately 2,400 connections are expected. However, this shall be further further explained in the CEO Endorsement.

- In case the project is supporting extension of existing diesel grids, i.e. hybrid mini-grids, please explain this further in the CEO Endorsement. If not, we suggest to modify the title of

the project as well as the narrative of the document to replace low-carbon mini-grids by renewable energy mini-grids. If the project is supporting hybridization with the main grid, under the risk section provide a mechanism to avoid further development of diesel systems.

- 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. Elaborate further on how the project will ensure replacing batteries and converters as well as O&M of the whole system during the lifetime.

- Innovative financial solutions are proposed under Component 3. This is very much welcome, but further reference shall be included to local banks as potential financiers, and how they will be engaged further with the proposed project.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

Regarding fourth comment/question:

As related to finance, the PPG drew the following main conclusions:

- The finance domain is heavily crowded and funding sources from GOB development partners other than UNDP are far larger than this GEF Project. To maximize impact and cost-effectiveness, the AMP will therefore focus on financial stakeholder coordination, and building synergies between programmes. Informal communication with stakeholders showed openness for such an approach.

- MG project developers tend to source capital outside Benin, thereby largely bypassing national funds (FERER) and local banks.

- Local banks have a potential role to play to support rural electricity users to acquire appliances and PUE-technologies. There are capacity voids (which the AMP aims to reduce) as well as opportunities to link with other sectors: agriculture, water supply, health, and e-businesses and services. The Project seeks to liaise with public entities from other sectors (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture) and businesses (such as telecom ? MTN) to accelerate the uptake of activities reliant on electricity inputs.

Actions taken:

A Table titled ?Minigrid Delivery Model in Benin ? Summary of Key Aspects? has been added in the CEO Endorsement Request document (para. 19) regarding concession duration/lifetime operation as well as other key aspects the questions and comments above refer to.

20/12/2022 JB

We have clarified these points in the key documents. Further to our modifications, we bring the following to the GEF's attention:

- 1) - The design of the project intentionally leaves the final determination of the type and number of pilots to implementation. This determination will be achieved through the development of a minigrid pilot plan in year 1 of project implementation, which will systematically assess options for the pilots according to a set of key AMP principles, and to ensure that the pilots are relevant, sustainable, and fully compliant with all safeguards, and aligned with national objectives.
 - Nonetheless the CEO ER does predict GEBs based on informed assumptions regarding illustrative minigrids that may be supported by the GEF INV budget for the pilots. Please see the earlier GHG Annex - ProDoc Annex 22 for a detailed description of these assumptions and calculations.
- 2) - Following consultations in the design of the project, the hybridization of existing diesel minigrids to convert them to diesel-solar minigrids is one of three possible general approaches to the minigrid pilots that may be pursued by the project.
 - This has been further clarified in the following two documents. Language has also now been clearly inserted to state that the GEF funding will never be used to finance interventions to grids where the diesel capacity is increased, and in no cases GEF funding would ever be invested in fossil fuel power generation assets.
 - In CEO ER: Added table with pilot types + intro text. See para 49 yellow highlights. (Attached)
 - In ProDoc: Para 64 (page 41) and Table with pilot types reworked. See in yellow highlights (Attached)

- Given hybridization remains an option, we would prefer to keep the low-carbon minigrid terminology in the documents.

* In CEO ER: Added table with pilot types + intro text. See para 49 yellow highlights.

* In ProDoc: Para 64 (page 41) and Table 3 with pilot types reworked. See in yellow highlights

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/16/2022 PM:

No. Many thanks for providing in the CEO Endorsement document the evidence of the consultations as well as the list of stakeholders consulted. It is also well noted that a stakeholder engagement plan is referenced and attached as a project supporting document. Since this is in French, please provide in the portal section on stakeholder engagement a summary on stakeholder engagement in project development and a summary of stakeholder engagement during project review.

10/7/2022 PM:

No. A detailed stakeholders engagement plan has been provided as an Annex to the ProDoc. However, please address the following comments:

- Provide information on when the stakeholders consultations during the PPG phase took place, how and which stakeholders were consulted. If available, please provide the minutes of the consultation. In addition to the ProDoc, all this info shall be included in the CEO Endorsement document.

- Local banks and financiers are missing in the list of stakeholders identified. Likewise, it is not clear whether the project is expected to benefit or impact any indigenous or minority peoples and local communities. If so, please identified the correspond communities and associations which represent them.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

Regarding the first comment/question:

Evidence of consultations at the country level is provided in a separate (PDF) document entitled "Benin AMP - Stakeholders consulted.pdf"

This document contains the list of stakeholders consulted at the following junctures of project development:

1. During Inception Meeting ("Atelier de Lancement") (pp. 1-9, includes invitation letter and initial distribution list);
2. Through field visits and bilateral meetings (pp. 8-10);
3. At the validation workshop ("Atelier de restitution"), pp. 11-13.

In addition, UNDP conducted consultations as part of its validation work with the GIZ, AFD and MCC Benin II.

Regarding the second comment/question:

In terms of the role of local banks and financiers, those are indeed important stakeholders to the project. Engagement with them will be performed once activities associated with Component 3 are prepared and their involvement clarified. Please note that they are referred to as either "rural banks" or "commercial banks" in the documents submitted.

Regarding the question of whether the project will benefit or impact any indigenous or minority peoples and local communities, this issue is documented and covered in UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) document. As the location of the minigrids has not yet been selected, impacts (positive or negative) on indigenous or minority peoples have not been determined at this stage. As a precautionary measure, the Indigenous Peoples standard (S6) has been triggered and Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework will be prepared prior to commencement of the Project to ensure that any risk on Indigenous Peoples has been considered. In addition, the project will not avoid locations where Indigenous Peoples are found to ensure that they may also benefit from the outputs should they choose to.

Actions taken:

Evidence of consultations has been provided in separate file.

20/12/2023 JB

We have prepared some paragraphs in English explaining the process and the various steps taken to be added to the Portal on resubmission.

* Stakeholder engagement write-up added to portal

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
12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/16/2022 PM:

No. It is well noted that a gender analysis and action plan is referenced and attached as a project supporting document. Since this is in French, please provide in the portal section on gender a summary of the findings of the analysis and action plan. In addition, the project could consider strengthening gender dimensions in project component 1 (Policy and regulation) and 4 (Digital and Knowledge Management).

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

20/12/2023 JB

We have included some paragraphs in English explaining the Gender Assessment and Action Plan. We have added mentions of gender-related actions and strategies in the ProDoc under appropriate components (yellow highlights).

* Gender Analysis and Action Plan write-up added to portal. Mentions added in ProDoc

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

10/7/2022 PM:

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

12/8/2022 PM:

Cleared.

10/7/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Table in Annex 6 of the ProDoc shall be incorporated in the CEO Endorsement document.
- Disposal of solar panels. The proposal shall include an explanation and risk mitigation measures for the safely disposal and/or recycling of solar panels. This point shall be linked to the sustainability section of the CEO Endorsement document, since by ensuring a correct disposal of solar panels we are contributing to the overall sustainability of the project.
- Please describe the project's risk mitigation strategy to avoid the use of forced labor in the supply chain of the solar panels to be imported.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

Regarding the second comment/question:

UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) deals with this, specifically under Risk 14 (Generation of hazardous waste (specifically e-waste) from the pilot minigrids that have been installed). This would be further documented and in the ESIA that will be undertaken for targeted locations. We welcome the suggestion to include a mention of this in

the sustainability section of the CEO ER (cf. ¶67). Furthermore, note that the environmentally responsible operation and end-of-life management of systems is a legal obligation for MG operators under Benin's national law. UNDP, as well as Benin's other development partners, are aware that additional support may be needed to transform this legal requirement into a reality, which is indeed a key aspect of sustainability. At the national level, the AMP will support GOB to put in place specific regulation and effective verification schemes.

Regarding the third comment/question, we reproduce below an earlier communication on the topic to the attention of the GEF Secretariat:

The issue of alleged forced labor concern two areas of AMP national projects, including this Benin project.

- Area 1: with regard to AMP national projects? GEF INV support, together with co-financing, into minigrid pilot investments. These pilots will directly procure PV materials.

- Area 2: with regard to AMP's general support to develop and grow minigrid markets, via policies and capacity building etc., which may then result in the general expanded use of PV materials.

The mechanism with which AMP will address alleged forced labor risks is via UNDP's safeguards policies and architecture.

- All AMP national projects have flagged standard #7 (S7), on labor, in their safeguard screening as an area of risk. This is the entry point via which risks of alleged forced labor will be addressed during implementation.

- AMP's safeguards framework (ESMF) document requires that during implementation each national project and pilot develop various safeguards documents, including safeguard assessments and plans (ESIAs, ESMPs) which further elaborate the approach to identified risks. For example, to ensure compliance with S7, the ESIAs and ESMPs are required to include written labor management procedures (LMPs) that will address these issues.

For issues related to AMP national projects? investment in minigrid pilots (Area 1), UNDP envisages mitigation measures against possible forced labor issues related to: (a) enhanced due diligence in minigrid developer's procurement exercises and contracting, including (i) supplier self-declarations and codes of conduct for employees related to supply chain inputs and (ii) legal clauses certifying/representing against forced labor; and (b) development of a monitoring framework for identified risk areas regarding labor issues over the course of project implementation, with accompanying monitoring indicators and methodology, including record keeping pertaining to solar PV modules.

For issues related to general market support (Area 2), UNDP envisage that the AMP's regional and national projects can play an important role in the general market on

awareness-raising, signaling and capacity-building with regard to safeguards measures on possible forced labor issues in the PV value chain. In particular, the AMP regional project's components on knowledge products and communities of practice will be explored as mechanisms to disseminate knowledge tools and good practice on these matters. Further, the AMP regional project will track developments and best practices in addressing this risk, including on a comprehensive solution around supply chain traceability and appropriate verification mechanisms, and share them with national projects.

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
10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response
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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response
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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/16/2022 PM:

No. On Annex E "Project Budget Table", the project Manager is being charged to components and PMC. This is ok according to the GEF guidelines. However, the costs associated with the project's execution should be charged to both the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? this includes the project's staff. With 120 million represented in loans and 3.05 million specifically allocated to PMC, please explore if there is room to cover part of the project's staff with the co-financing PMC.

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

20/12/2023 JB

The Project Manager's tasks are predominantly technical in their nature/quality, requiring critical technical, specialized expertise and skill sets for their effective performance, and for this reason are charged to technical components. To be clear, on top of general management activities that a generic project manager could perform (approximately 20-30%), the project manager in this instance will see approximately 70-80% of the full-time equivalent dedicated to technical tasks, as detailed in the Project Manager terms of reference in Annex 7 (page 120) of the Project Document. Some examples of technical tasks of the Project Manager include, set out in Annex 7 :

- ? To engage with GOB authorities and other stakeholders on minigrad development and regulation;
- ? To promote inter-institutional coordination and partnerships to support deployment of minigrad solutions in Benin;
- ? To draft terms of reference and work specifications, and overseeing all contractors' work;
- ? To supervise contracted activities and verify the quality of delivered services and goods;
- ? To provide technical backstopping for project teams and working groups, specifically for project components 1, 3 and 5;

Also, the Project Document budget clarifies that USD 50,000 of UNDP (TRAC) funds, as cash co-financing, are committed towards Project Management Costs. (see p. 85, as well as p. 89, Table 7, under budget note #33).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/8/2022 PM:

No. Unfortunately, we cannot see this addition to Annex A.

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes, with comments. In the project results framework, please include in parenthesis a comment that Indicators 1 and 2 corresponds to GEF's Core Indicators 6 and 11 respectively.

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

Thank you. This has been added to Annex A (Project Results Framework)

20/12/2023 JB

This has been addressed. Thank you.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/8/2022 PM:

Cleared.

10/7/2022 PM:

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?

Agency Response

12/06/2022 JBF:

In addition to the responses provided to STAP comments at the PFD stage for the overall AMP approach and countries, diesel generator industry in Benin in particular is not of a nature to hinder project success, primarily because of the simple but severe logistical challenges associated with supplying some of Benin's remote communities with diesel. Furthermore, no such lobby (i.e. industry association) has been encountered or mentioned, perhaps given the logistical and policy advantage that renewable energy-based systems benefit from, or the lack of interest of the overall oil and gas industry for minigrids specifically.

Regardless of what precedes, should resistance in communities or villages emerge regarding the comparative advantage of RE minigrids (vs diesel or gasoline, for that matter) - which was judged by the project design team to be highly unlikely at this time - this would be added to the Project Risk Log and added to the Monitoring and Evaluation processes so that adaptive management actions can be taken (e.g. boosting communications efforts, etc.).

Actions taken:

Added to Annex B of the CEO ER.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/7/2022 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/7/2022 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/7/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

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
10/7/2022 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2022 PM:

Cleared.

12/8/2022 PM:

No. In addition to address the comments above, please make sure to remove UNDP internal comments right before section "1b. Project Map and Coordinates".

10/7/2022 PM:

No. Please address comments identified above.

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