



Mali national child project under the Africa Minigrids Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10834

Countries

Mali

Project Name

Mali national child project under the Africa Minigrids Program

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/30/2022

Review completed by PM

2/22/2023

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

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

*****PLEASE MAKE ALL CHANGES IN THE DOCUMENT HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW FOR EASE OF REFERENCE*****

Cleared.

PPO Comments - Consolidated review:

02/22/23, FB:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

1. Many of the tables are off margins, please correct so that all information can be readable when downloading the CEO endorsement that needs to be circulated.

2. On the budget: Project coordinator/project assistant is charged to project components. Per guidelines, project's staff should be charged to the GEF and co-financing portions allocated to PMC. Co-financing allocated to PMC is nearly 14 million, and 148 million of co-financing is represented in grants/loans. Please revise accordingly.

10/20/2022:

Item "Part I - Project Info - Focal Area Elements" Cleared.

The project is well aligned with the CCM1-1 "De-centralized renewable power with energy storage".

Agency Response

21/02/2023 CO

1. 1. Formatting has been done so that all tables that were off-margin are now within the margins and readable.
2. The 50% part of the project coordinator for Y1-Y3 that were previously charged to project components have been reallocated to PMC. The UN Volunteer costs were moved from PMC to Component 2, since the Volunteer's role will be focused on technical support to Component 2 activities.

With regard to co-financing allocated to PMCs, we have made the assumption, as per previous GEF Sec requests, that approximately 10% - in alignment with the GEF's own funding of PMCs in the project - of the co-financing can be attributed to PMCs.

Project Taxonomy p. 7-8, Table 3 p.51-55, Table 4 p.56, Annex A p.78-83, Annex G p.86-88

Table B p.3-4

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

Cleared.

02/22/2023, FB

General Comments:

A) Cleared.

B) Addressed below.

Specific comments:

1. (a., b. and c.) to 6: Cleared.

10/20/2022:

GENERAL COMMENTS

A: Please check the type of co-financing and the investment mobilized column entry as most of them are inaccurate: loans and grants should be considered as Investment mobilized.

B. There are several large co-financing tranches that are made of multiproject envelopes, which are being claimed in their entirety as co-financing. We need much more granular description of how each of the projects listed is in fact related to the GEF-UNDP project and it supports or is supported by the GEF project activities. Please provide all details in the box related to how investment mobilized was identified, for each of the cofinanciers, and for each of the large tranches/projects included in the letters. We cannot just accept face-value letters that take all amount value of existing rural electrification projects and consider the entire amount as co-financing for this project. In some cases, smaller portions will be relevant, but not the entire project. Need more details.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. AER-Mali: there are three separate budget lines in Table C corresponding to AER. There is however, only one co-financing letter (with relative translation). The letter indicates an amount of EUR 38,328,953.18 (USD 38,328,953.18). However, this is not consistent with the sum of the three amounts listed on Table C. Also, it is not clear how the overall amount is allocated to the three separate entries. Finally, the type of cofinancing is all listed as grant/in-kind, whereas in the letter part of the financing is loan:

a. -> clarify overall AER amount discrepancy.

b. -> clarify allocation of amount in the three lines

c. -> clarify type of cofinancing and why all listed as "recurrent expenditures". Please include explanation of all these elements in the field related to how investment mobilized was identified.

2. Co-fin from ANGMV: the letter states a co-financing of 40M, while only 32 M are listed in Table C. please revise or provide rationale. Also, the amount does not look classifiable as recurrent expenditures, please revise.

3. Co-Fin from AMADER: (i) missing unofficial translation (ii) listed as recurrent expenditure, this is not correct, (iii) amounts do not match the entry in the portal, (iv) We need more details on how we can consider all the project listed as cofinancing.

4. AfDB co-fin letter: There is no link between the amount reported in the Mali child project and the AfDB letter. please provide justification or remove this amount. Also, this would not be listed as recurrent expenditures - please revise.

5. There is no co-fin letter for SIDA.

6. The GIZ letter is not consistent with the portal value.

Agency Response

Response:

General comments:

A. The investment mobilized column entries were revised accordingly. All grants and loans were indicated at "investment mobilized" instead of "recurring revenues".

Table C p.4

B. Details regarding the projects included in the co-financing letters have been provided under Table C on co-financing sources. The co-financing letters have been revised accordingly to only consider AMP Mali related activities and to reflect co-financing amounts provided.

Below Table C p.4-5

Specific comments:

1. Co-financing from AER-Mali

- a. A revised co-financing letter for AER-Mali has been provided whereby no more discrepancy is reflected in the CEO ER.
- b. Clarifications about the three lines on AER-Mali's co-financing have been provided: AER-Mali provided 2 co-financing letters (see Annex 13) which include (i) a first co-financing letter with a set of projects relevant to AMP Mali's activities and which are either loans or grants (ii) a second one for the in-kind contribution of AER-Mali to the PMU. The in-kind contribution for the PMU is considered as 'recurring expenses' as these are expenses for the office, electricity and other related costs that are recurring each month. The in-kind contribution for the PMU was revised by AER-Mali from USD 122,581 to USD 82,815.
- c. The type of co-financing was revised for the loan and grant co-financing to 'investment mobilized'.

Annex 13

Below Table C p.5

Tables B & C p.4

Annex 13

2. Co-financing from ANGMV

The co-financing letter was revised with the correct amount of USD 32,000,000 to cover only the AMP Mali implementation duration. The type of co-financing was changed to 'investment mobilized'.

Annex 13

Table C p.4 and below Table C on p.5

3. Co-financing from AMADER

- (i) the unofficial translation got added in Annex 13
- (ii) the type of co-financing was changed to 'Investment mobilized under Table C
- (iii) amounts in the co-financing letter and in the portal are matching now

(iv) details of all AMADER projects considered in the co-financing letter have been listed in the table below table C. Co-financing provided are a mix of investments (e.g., construction of minigrids in rural areas) and technical assistance (e.g., capacity building for a variety of stakeholders, facilitating access to finance, etc.) relevant to AMP Mali.

Annex 13 : Below Table C on p.5

4. AfDB co-financing letter

The AfDB letter covers all countries under AMP rounds 2 and 3. Regarding Mali, for the period 2023-2027 of AMP Mali's implementation period, 2023-2027. 2 projects in the co-financing letter are relevant:

- ? The Desert to Power project covers 11 countries and lasts for 5 years ending in 2023. Hence only 1 year for Mali is considered as co-financing. Total project USD 5M / 11 countries / 5 years duration * 1 year considered = USD 90,909
- ? The Multinational Africa Mini-Grid Acceleration programme lasts for 4 years ending in 2024 and covers 8 countries. Hence 2 years are considered for AMP Mali. Total project USD 7M/ 8 countries / 4 years duration * 2 years considered = USD 437,500

Below Table C on p.5

5. Co-financing letter for SIDA

The co-financing letter from SIDA was not received and this co-financing has therefore been removed.

6. Co-financing from GIZ

USD 38,331 is considered as co-financing from GIZ's Endev project and is added correctly into the portal.

GEF Submission Portal

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

Yes, the financing request presented is in line with the proposed objectives.

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

Yes, the status of utilization of the PPG resources was provided. The Agency can use the outstanding balance by up to one year after the CEO Approval of this project.

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

the amount of GEB is within the range to be expected for this project type and the amount of project financing and co-financing.

Agency Response

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

The project is well justified, including on the background energy situation, the connection with the Great Green Wall efforts on energy components, and on existing risks and barriers analysis to renewable energy penetration.

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

10/20/2022:

Cleared.

Baseline scenario and associated/related projects and activities are outlined.

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

Cleared.

02/22/2023, FB:

1. Cleared. Explanation provided.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

10/21/2022:

Please address the following questions:

1. Allocation/definition of responsibilities/roles between WB/AfDB and GEF-UNDP project: Output 2.1, digital tendering platform: The project document mentions that at PPG it was established WB and AfDB will take care of the digital tendering platform.

depth training to use analytical tools and data management technologies.

As indicated above, in Mali the digital tendering platform will be taken care of by the World Bank and AfDB. During PPG, it has been agreed World Bank that UNDP as well as other relevant partners (in addition to AMADER under which the platform would be located) will be consulted actively involved in the tendering and roll-out phases. AMADER will take ownership and the lead to ensure coordination and partnership with relevant stakeholders. This will also contribute to integrating AMP results to the digital platform.

However, the project document states the PMU will design the tender process on the platform:

Activity 2.1.2. Design of tender process for pilot(s) using a digital platform.

The project's pilot(s) may involve private sector engagement in various forms, including models involving private sector minigrid ownership, private sector EPC, and private sector O&M services. Where there is private sector engagement in the pilot(s), a competitive tender process will be executed using the digital tendering feature of the digital platform procured under Component 4.

Under this activity, the PMU, working with the digital platform vendor, specialist engineering, financial, procurement, and legal expertise, and the AMP regional project, will translate the approach set out in the project's Minigrid Pilot Plan into the design of a customized tendering process on the digital platform (with AfDB/World Bank and AMADER) including requirements, specifications and evaluation criteria. Feedback can be solicited from a gender-diverse selection of private sector actors with experience responding to government tenders (not limited just to electricity) about whether the proposed digital modality and in-person supports will result in a more level or less level playing field for male and female prospective developers. The terms of reference will consider, among other factors, which the PMU will determine with support from the AMP Regional project, the following:

- (i) establishing a requirement and incentives for pilots to share data with the project

It is unclear what the WB / AfDB role will be vs. the project's PMU. Please clarify how this was discussed and how the respective responsibilities on this key outcome of the GEF-UNDP project have been allocated. This question is also relevant to output 4.1: since the digital platform is "to be procured by the WB/AfDB and implemented by AMADER", it remains unclear what the specific role of the GEF-UNDP project is and what was discussed/agreed with the other actors. Please clarify this in the document.

2. Output 2.2: the report seems to have a wide scope and the associated allocation of GEF resources to this output is significant, if compared for instance to the investment component (2.1). It also seems to refer to role of national governments and DFIs to boost minigrids, which is too broad and generic a topic to make a difference for Mali. We suggest restricting the scope of the study to approaches, solutions and models that apply to Mali and that are directly linked to development of minigrids pilots. We also recommend considering a reduction of the cost of this output, 368k seems disproportionate for these outcomes.

3. Output 3.2: different from other TA activities, this output does not include a gap assessment. Is information on capacity building gaps/needs for local FI already available which can be used? or would activity 3.2.1 be preceded by a gap assessment to inform how to best use GEF TA activities through output 3.2?

Agency Response

21/02/2023 CO

1. After discussing further with AMADER, fact is the digital tendering platform will be procured by AfDB as part of a feasibility study around minigrids over 100 localities across the country and should be rolled out before AMP Mali's launch. As such, activity 2.1.2 (?Design of tender process for pilot(s) using a digital platform?) has been taken out and aspects related to the tendering process using the future tendering platform have been added to the Minigrid Pilot Plan (activity 2.1.1.).

Under Output 4.2., elements were modified to clearly indicate that AMP Mali would only cover the minigrids data management & monitoring platform that is complementary to the minigrids digital tendering platform (AfDB/AMADER). This is an additionality that is highly welcomed by AMADER and under discussion within this agency.

Both digital platforms would need to communicate between each other and be integrated under a digital umbrella platform: The Rural Electrification Platform. The latter would also be a centralized repository of all market assessment, regulatory and legal texts, knowledge documents, feasibility studies, training materials and webinars, relevant events and conferences, etc.

2. The scope of the report has been further clarified, i.e. focusing on value chains that could be boosted via productive use of energy and that will support rural development. These value chains should be as much as possible related to priority value chains of the Great Green Wall (GGW) initiative which is a key cross-cutting component of AMP Mali. This comprehensive report is critical to support the implementation of the GGW strategy and especially of green and productive ecosystems that would be boosted via green minigrids and access to electricity. AMP Mali would as such contribute to existing GGW initiative while multiplying its impact, and in a sustainable manner. This focus has been further clarified in the narrative of output 2.2.

The amount of USD 368k (revised to USD 356k in this submission) is not only for output 2.2. but also for the technical assistance parts of outputs 2.1 and 2.3. These include e.g., a gap assessment in terms of capacity building needs, offering relevant training and support to local minigrid operators and solar panel installers, awareness raising of pilot project communities as well as training youth and women in the community to become rural electrician and more (employment creation), technical assistance around productive use of energy which is relatively nascent in Mali, and technical assistance aspects around the tendering process and monitoring.

3. A gap assessment has been added to Activity 3.2.1. to inform how to best use GEF TA activities under output 3.2. The budget has been revised accordingly.

CEO ER : Table 3 identified partners p.39 and paragraph on Stakeholders p.45-46

CEO ER p. 39-40, p. 47-48

CEO ER p.40

CEO ER p.43 & budget

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The child project is well aligned with the approved PFD and with the CCM focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

While there is lots of activity in the country related to rural electrification, this project focuses on a niche that is not entirely explored and look to support the development of 100% renewable minigrids. Other financial institutions have done significant work in the country, but mostly promoting hybrid diesel+PV minigrids. In addition, there is a clear incremental reasoning in the activities linking the rural energy component to the Great Green Wall development strategy and investment plans.

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

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The calculation of the contribution to CI.6 remains in line with the estimates at PFD level, and within acceptable range of approximation.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The exact pilot sites (e.g. intervention zones) in rural areas of the GGW strip in Mali will be selected at implementation phase based on objective criteria validated during the validation workshop in September 2022.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Yes, the project will contribute to the regional program both in terms of GEB results and in terms of knowledge generation and exchange.

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

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The Agency submitted a stakeholder engagement plan which also includes the list of stakeholders which were consulted during PPG stage, as well as the main methods that will be used to engage stakeholders during project implementation.

Agency Response

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

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The Agency submitted a gender gap analysis and a gender action plan. Project results will be tracked in a sex disaggregated way. Some suggestions on how to actively close the gender gap are also provided in the "Recommendations" section, although they could be made stronger and more specific in the action plan. The Agency will have to report on the operationalization of the recommendations of the gender action plan through the PIR and MTR/TE.

Agency Response
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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The stakeholder engagement plan/report maps out the key private sector players and identifies the interactions the PPG team had with them and the inputs received.

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
02/22/2023:

Cleared.

10/21/2022:

1. Please include considerations related to climate risk screening and related countermeasures/mitigation actions. The Agency should follow the steps highlighted by the GEF STAP guidance on this topic, available at the following link:

<https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/stap-chairs-report-gef-agency-retreat-1-april-2020>

Agency Response
21/02/2023 CO

Climate risks aspects treated in the SESP are clearly put forward in the document. Main risks include the multiplication of climate incidents impacting largely rural development (e.g., reduced agricultural yields, growing deforestation, increased poverty) as well as reduced access to electricity via hydropower (from 51% of the power mix in 2009 to 18% in 2022).

AMP Mali integrated across the project mitigation measures to be implemented during the project and to be continued after the project. This includes for instance:

- ? At policy level: the integration of RE and green minigrids into the GGW Strategy and Action Plan (Component 1)
- ? At pilot level: the construction of green minigrids in different sites with various technologies and business models that could be replicated across Mali
- ? At capacity building level: raising awareness and training a variety of relevant stakeholders around green minigrids and productive use of renewable energy to reduce GHG and increase resilience

At financing level: strengthening capacities of local financial players including facilitating financial products and services to promote green minigrids and productive use of renewable energy.

CEO ER p.65

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Note that no direct execution support is provided by UNDP for this project (full NIM).

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Consistency with national priorities is highlighted in the CEO ER document.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Table 7 presents the key KM deliverables and relative expected timelines.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

A budgeted M&E plan is provided.

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
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Key socio economic benefits are listed.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Required Annexes are uploaded in the document section of the portal.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The PRF is provided.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

no outstanding comments.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

The Agency has provided responses to the comments from the France and Germany Council members, which appears adequate at the CEO ER stage.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/21/2022:

Cleared.

Information on PPG utilization and outstanding balances were provided. Agency has up to 12 months after the CEO approval to use any outstanding balance.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Project maps have been included. Specific coordinates for the sites specifically targeted for minigrid development will be communicated through PIR/MTR and TE, as they will be identified after project inception.

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

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 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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
02/22/23:

Project is recommended for technical clearance.

10/21/2022:

not yet - Agency is requested to address the comments in this review sheet and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations