



Regional Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10843

Countries

Regional

Project Name

Regional Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

7/31/2021

Review completed by PM

10/14/2021

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ITEM CLEARED -

FB, 11/5/2021

PPO Review, 10/19/2021:

1. On Project Information: If the Executing partner is UNDP, the *Executing Partner Type* selected can't be *CSO*. If this project will be co-executed between UNDP and the Rocky Mountain Institute please request the agency to have *Other?* stipulated as executing partner type.

The screenshot shows a form titled "Part I: Project Information" with the following fields and values:

Name of Parent Program	GEF-7 Africa Mini-grids Program			
GEF ID	10843		Project Type	FSP
Type of Trust Fund	CBIT/NGI	CBIT No	NGI No	Project Title
GET				Regional Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program
Countries	Regional		Agency(es)	UNDP
Other Executing Partner(s)	UNDP Rocky Mountain Institute		Executing Partner Type	CSO

2. The duration of the project does not match the timeline between *expected implementation* and *completion date*. Please request the agency to review and amend. If the project is expected to last 48 months then the expected completion date should be 1/28/2026

Submission Date 7/30/2021	Expected Implementation Start 1/29/2022	Expected Completion Date 7/30/2025
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 317,331.00

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project is well aligned with objective CCM-1-1.

Agency Response

CM 28/10/2021

Response:

1. Incorporated. ?Other? has been selected as the executing partner type.
2. Incorporated. The expected implementation and completion dates have been updated.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part I, Project Information.

2. Project description summary. 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

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

yes, the project structure is appropriate to achieve expected project outcomes/outputs as described in the ProDoc.

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

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ITEM CLEARED -

FB, 11/5/2021

PPO Review, 10/19/2021:

1. RMI: It is not possible to confirm whether the co-financing from the Rocky Mountain Institute is a Grant or in-kind. As per GEF guidelines, please request the cofinancing provider to revise the letter to clearly include the (i) type of co-financing, (ii) the amount and (iii) the time frame. OK

2. Carbon Trust: the co-financing amounts are in GBP, and as per GEF guidelines they should be in USD. As an intermediate action, please clearly specify in the section "how any investment mobilized was identified": the exchange rate used, with source/reference and the date of exchange rate, so that it is clear which conversion factor is used. OK

3. Since UNDP is the implementing agency for this project, only UNDP should be categorized as *GEF Agency* (please correct 1 line below). All other agencies (i.e. AfDB) should be categorized as *Donor Agency*, not *GEF Agency*. OK

GEF Agency	AfDB, Angola 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00	
Donor Agency	UNDP (Regional)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,430,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), GCF Activities	Loans	Investment mobilized	16,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), Green minigrid helpdesk TA	Grant	Investment mobilized	900,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), RBF	Loans	Investment mobilized	8,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), AMAP TA	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,400,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Madagascar 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Angola 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00	

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB:

1. cleared.
2. cleared
- 3.1. cleared.
- 3.2 cleared
- 3.3 cleared
4. cleared
5. cleared
6. cleared

8/25/2021, FB:

1. Evidence for each one of the sources should be uploaded separately to the portal, to the corresponding source field.

2. For several of the sources of cofinance, the type of co-financing is marked as "grant" and the type of investment as "recurrent expenditures". Please clarify why "grant" and not "in-kind", which is what is normally provided in cases where "recurrent expenditure" is selected.

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Civil Society Organization	Rocky Mountain Institute	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	2,800,000.00	
Private Sector	African Minigrid Developers Association	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00	
Donor Agency	Carbon Trust (DFID)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,080,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), GCF Activities	Loans	Investment mobilized	16,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), Green minigrid helpdesk TA	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	900,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), RBF	Loans	Investment mobilized	8,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), AMAP TA	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	3,600,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Madagascar 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Angola 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
Donor Agency	UNDP (Regional)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,430,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Madagascar 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Chad 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	600,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Mauritania 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				39,160,000.00	

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Civil Society Organization	Rocky Mountain Institute	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	2,800,000.00	
Private Sector	African Minigrid Developers Association	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00	
Donor Agency	Carbon Trust (DFID)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,080,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), GCF Activities	Loans	Investment mobilized	16,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), Green minigrid helpdesk TA	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	900,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), RBF	Loans	Investment mobilized	8,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB (Regional), AMAP TA	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	3,600,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Madagascar 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	AfDB, Angola 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
Donor Agency	UNDP (Regional)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,430,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Madagascar 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Chad 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	600,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNDP, Mauritania 'Third-Party Funded' National Project	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				39,160,000.00	

3. AfDB Regional:

3.1. With regards to the AfDB cofinancing, and specifically the co-financing for the Regional project: it is not clear how funding the AfDB is channeling for minigrids in DRC (AfDB+GCF "DRC Green Mini-Grid Programme") can be claimed as co-financing for the AMP Regional, especially considering that AMP does not cover DRC. The mere fact of the existence of AfDB minigrid investments in countries across Africa does not grant the possibility to consider them all as co-financing. If this investment is identified as cofinancing, more explanation is needed on what the logic/financial link with the AMP Program / Regional Child Project.

The same applies for all other co-financing provided by AfDB in countries not covered by the AMP (as listed in the footnotes to the document compiling the co-financing letters). An explanation of the link for each of the lines of co-financing listed in the GEF document is needed and should be included in the section on "how investment mobilized" was identified", below Table C.

Please clarify or remove this amount from the co-financing.

3.2. AMAP TA is listed at 4 mil over 5 years = 800k/year. If prorated for 2022-2024, i.e. 3 years, this should come up to 2.4 mil, and not 3.6 as listed.

3.3. There is an additional budget line in the AfDB cofinancing letter ("Green Mini-Grid Market Development Program") which seems to have not been included in the list of Table C. Please provide explanation for this exclusion.

For the AMP Regional Project

Entity	Project Name	Amount	Type	Time-frame-
African Development Bank Group (ADB window) + Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Mini-grid activities ¹	USD 40 million	Loan	2019 - 2023
African Development Bank through Sustainable Energy Fund for Africa (SEFA)	GMG Technical Assistance Support Programme ²	USD 3.6 million	Grant	2016 - 2024
	Results-Based Financing for mini-grids ³	USD 12 million (pipeline)	Loan and Grant	2021 - 2023
	Green Mini-Grid Market Development Program (Phase 2 + Interim Scale Up)	USD 3.6 million	Grant	2018 - 2021
	Africa Mini-Grid Acceleration Program (AMAP) ⁴	USD 4 million	Technical Assistance - Grant	2020 - 2024

4. AfDB Country level projects: Please clarify why the co-financing provided by AfDB for Madagascar and Angola (1 mil each for these third-party funded projects) is labelled as recurrent expenditures and not Investment Mobilized (since they are grants and not in-kind).

5. UNDP: please confirm why the UNDP financing for Chad, Madagascar and Mauritania is labelled as recurrent expenditures and not Investment Mobilized.

6: RMI: please confirm that indeed this should be labelled as recurrent expenditures, instead of investment mobilized. Is this a cash grant provided? in which case it would be investment mobilized. If it is not cash, then it should probably be "in kind" and not "grant".

Agency Response
CG_11th October 2021

Comment:

"1. Evidence for each one of the sources should be uploaded separately to the portal, to the corresponding source field.

2. For several of the sources of cofinance, the type of co-financing is marked as ""grant"" and the type of investment as ""recurrent expenditures"". Please clarify why ""grant"" and not ""in-kind"", which is what is normally provided in cases where ""recurrent expenditure"" is selected.

3. AfDB Regional:

3.1. With regards to the AfDB cofinancing, and specifically the co-financing for the Regional project: it is not clear how funding the AfDB is channeling for minigrids in DRC (AfDB+GCF ""DRC Green Mini-Grid Programme"") can be claimed as co-financing for the AMP Regional, especially considering that AMP does not cover DRC. The mere fact of the existence of AfDB minigrad investments in countries across Africa does not grant the possibility to consider them all as co-financing. If this investment is identified as cofinancing, more explanation is needed on what the logic/financial link with the AMP Program / Regional Child Project.

The same applies for all other co-financing provided by AfDB in countries not covered by the AMP (as listed in the footnotes to the document compiling the co-financing letters). An explanation of the link for each of the lines of co-financing listed in the GEF document is needed and should be included in the section on ""how investment mobilized"" was identified"", below Table C.

Please clarify or remove this amount from the co-financing.

3.2. AMAP TA is listed at 4 mil over 5 years = 800k/year. If prorated for 2022-2024, i.e. 3 years, this should come up to 2.4 mil, and not 3.6 as listed.

3.3. There is an additional budget line in the AfDB cofinancing letter (""Green Mini-Grid Market Development Program"") which seems to have not been included in the list of Table C. Please provide explanation for this exclusion.

4. AfDB Country level projects: Please clarify why the co-financing provided by AfDB for Madagascar and Angola (1 mil each for these third-party funded projects) is labelled as recurrent expenditures and not Investment Mobilized (since they are grants and not in-kind).

5. UNDP: please confirm why the UNDP financing for Chad, Madagascar and Mauritania is labelled as recurrent expenditures and not Investment Mobilized.

6: RMI: please confirm that indeed this should be labelled as recurrent expenditures, instead of investment mobilized. Is this a cash grant provided? in which case it would be investment mobilized. If it is not cash, then it should probably be "in kind" and not "grant".

1. Evidence for each one of the six sources of co-financing has been uploaded separately to the portal.

2. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated and sources of co-financing marked as "recurrent expenditures" have been now relabelled correctly as "in-kind".

3. AfDB Regional:

3.1. The section on "how investment mobilized" was identified? (below Table C) in the CEO Endorsement request has been updated to provide the required explanation.

3.2. The section on "how investment mobilized" was identified? (below Table C) in the CEO Endorsement request has been updated to correct this.

3.3. The additional budget line corresponding to the Green Mini-Grid Market Development Program (Phase2) and Interim Scale-up was not included in Table C because of its timeframe being 2018 ? 2021 and not coinciding with the regional project's implementation period.

4. AfDB Country level projects: The CEO Endorsement request has been updated and AfDB co-financing for Angola and Madagascar, initially marked as " recurrent expenditures", have been relabelled as "investment mobilized".

5. UNDP: The CEO Endorsement request has been updated and UNDP co-financing for Chad, Madagascar and Mauritania , initially marked as " recurrent expenditures", have been relabelled as "investment mobilized".

6: RMI: The CEO Endorsement request has been updated and RMI co-financing, initially marked as "recurrent expenditures", has been relabelled as "investment mobilized".

Reference :

1. GEF Portal
- 2? 5. CEO Endorsement Request ? Table C

CM 28/10/2021

Response:

1. A revised co-financing letter from RMI has been uploaded to the portal.
2. Explanation on pro-rating of Carbon Trust co-financing letter amounts to match project implementation period is provided below Table C in the section on how investment was mobilized. Also, explanation on the exchange rate, with source and date of access, has been provided there.
3. Table C has been updated and only UNDP categorised as GEF Agency.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part I, Table C, and below Table C.

5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, resources are available in the amounts requested.

Agency Response
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

N/A - this project is funded with CCM regional set aside.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, funding from the CCM FA set aside is available.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, funding from the CCM FA set aside is available.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

A PPG was not requested for this child project.

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB: yes, core indicators are included.

Agency Response

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB: yes, the project taxonomy is included.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there 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

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

1.Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections. This can be a short summary and a reference to the longer description in the UNDP ProDoc.

Note: This comment is a general comment for the entire CEO ER. We noted that many sections were either filled in or filled in with very little information compared to what is in the ProDoc. While we would not want to duplicate the entire content of the ProDoc, we have to at least include summaries of the relevant info for each section of this "Part II - Project Justification" portion. This may either be through cut and paste of the whole relevant ProDoc sections, or by just including a short summary and then a reference to the relevant portions of the ProDoc.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to reflect detail of how the project aim to address global environmental problems, including root causes and barriers.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 1*.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to reflect detail of the baseline scenario and baseline projects and the process to derive this baseline.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 2*.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG _ 11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to reflect (i) the proposed alternative scenario, (ii) the refinements made to the initial PFD given the enhanced understanding of the baseline scenario, (iii) a description of the project components and (iv) how it aims to contribute to the targeted outcomes.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 3*.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to show alignment with the relevant GEF Focal area: Objective 1, 'Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs' of the GEF-7 Climate Change Focal Area, with the SDG 7 'Affordable and Clean Energy', and SDG 13 'Climate Action'

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 4*.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to demonstrate incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline and co-financing.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 5*.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the information contained in Annex 11, as well as a clear reference that more information are included in Annex 11 and that estimation of the contribution from the National Child Projects are included in each of the Child Projects' project documentation.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Additional explanation on targets, including reference to Annex 11, has been added in the CEO Endorsement Request below the Core Indicators table in Section F and in Part II, Point 1a, Item 6.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part I, Section F

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG_ 11th October 2021

Incorporated. An elaboration on innovation and sustainable, including the potential for scaling up has been included in the CEO Endorsement request

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Item 7*.

8. 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

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, a Map is included.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

yes, the contribution to the regional program is outlined, and further explained in the ProDoc.

Agency Response

10. 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

ITEM CLEARED -

FB, 11/5/2021

PPO comment, 10/19/2021:

1. It is well noted that the submission includes a stakeholder engagement plan but it is unclear how civil society organization have been consulted and or their potential role in the implementation. Agency should provide some addition information in this regard.

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

A stakeholder analysis is included in the Portal CEO ER , and an Engagement Plan is provided in Annex 8.

However, a somewhat more granular description of the consultation process that was carried out in the context of the project design should be included in this section. Please address this point.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to reflect detail of the stakeholder consultation that occurred during the concept design and PPG phase. The SEP Engagement Plan, Annex 8, was similarly updated with an elaboration on the stakeholder engagement process.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 2, *Stakeholders*; and
Annex 8 to the Project Document, Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

CG 28/10/2021

Response Part II, Stakeholders.

Incorporated. The CEO Endorsement request has been updated to reflect 'Other' for the type of engagement with civil society with an accompanying clarification added to explain the selection.

The Project Taxonomy Tables have also been updated in both the CEO Endorsement request and the Project Document to remove the selection of civil society (level 2). An explanation has been provided in the CEO ER Part II (2. Stakeholders) as to the interfaces with civil society for the AMP.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Item 2. Stakeholders

CEO Endorsement request, Part I, Section G, *Project Taxonomy*; and

Annex 14 to the Project Document, Project Taxonomy

11. 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

ITEM CLEARED -

FB, 11/5/2021

PPO comment, 10/19/2021:

[rectified]

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc /Annex 9 relevant sections.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The GEF CEO endorsement request has been amended to include a summary / overview of the key gender related considerations and actions as identified in the gender analysis and plan (Annex 9 of the Project Document)

Reference:

Amended under Part II, Point 3, *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* in the CEO Endorsement request.

CG 28/20/2021

Response Part II, Gender Analysis and Plan.

The comment is not applicable as per GEFSEC email received after the project was returned via the portal.

Reference :

12. 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

Item cleared.

10/13/2021, FB.

8/25/2021, FB:

Please include in the GEF CEO ER a summary of the UNDP ProDoc relevant sections.

More information is needed here on:

1. who are the key PS stakeholders engaged/to be engaged, 2 what we offer to/expect from them, 3 what they offer to/expect from the AMP, 3 how do we ensure the key PS actors are engaged overtime and actively participate/contribute to the activities of the AMP.

Agency Response

CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. The summary related to private sector engagement has been augmented to include information regarding:

- identified private sector players?
- the contribution that the AMP expects to make to enhance private sector participation in the market?
- inputs that will be sought from the PS to inform the AMP implementation, and anticipated engagement strategy and approach.

Reference:

Amended under Part II, Point 4, *Private Sector Engagement* in the CEO Endorsement Request.

13. Risk. 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

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

A risk registry is duly included.

Agency Response

14. 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

this item is cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

1. cleared.

2. cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Institutional arrangements are described both in the GEF ER, and in the ProDoc.

1. reference is made to Annex 12, which is not to be found in the portal. Please upload it or clarify the discrepancy.

2. The project board include Development Partners. The GEF would appreciate being included in this group of organizations.

Agency Response

CG_ 11th October 2021

Incorporated.

1. Annex 12 has been prepared as a separate file to be uploaded to the portal.

2. The GEF has been included as Development Partner on the Project Board. The inclusion is reflected in both the CEO Endorsement request and the UNDP Project Document.

Reference:

Annex 12 to the Regional Project Document has been prepared as a separate file to be uploaded to the portal.

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 6, *Institutional Arrangement and Coordination*; and in the Regional Project Document, Section VII, GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A - the project is Regional in scope.

Agency Response

16. 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
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

the explanation provided, indicating that the entire Regional Child Project can in effect be considered the AMP's knowledge platform is helpful.

Agency Response

17. 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
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

yes, an M&E plan is included in line with GEF policies.

Agency Response

18. 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
Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

The section include a description of how the Regional project will contribute to socio economic benefits in the countries where National Child projects will be implemented.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ITEM CLEARED -

FB, 11/5/2021

PPO comment, 10/19/2021:

1. Budget in Annex E of Portal: (which has to be the same as in the documents? tab and in ProDoc): inclusion of a readable budget table is a requirement considering that may readers only have access to the pdf file of the portal view:

1. There are some formatting issues on the budget and some number cross the component columns. Please request the agency to harmonize and make sure the budget table is clear. Agency can request GEFSEC through the PM assigned for help to fix any formatting issues. Agency can contact Wanderson (wbatistaroldao@worldbankgroup.org) to have a call and solve this.
2. Office supplies have been charged to one of the component: the agency is requested to change this cost to the PMC.

this item is cleared.

10/13/2021, FB

1. cleared.

2. cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Some of the information included in annexes should be included directly also in the GEF ER document:

1. Theory of change diagram, and relative narrative description (this can be included as part of the new sections relative to project justification and description as requested above).

2. Project budget in the GEF required format.

Agency Response

CG_ 11th October 2021

Incorporated.

1. The Theory of Change diagrams for the overall AMP Program and the Regional Project have been incorporated into the revised narrative description under Part II, 1a.
2. The Project budget in the GEF required format has been included in the CEO Endorsement request as uploaded to the GEF Portal.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Project description*.

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Point 1a, *Project description (towards the very end)*.

CG 28/10/2021

Response:

1. (a) Formatting issue have been fixed in the budget uploaded to the portal.
(b) Office supplies have been moved to PMCs and a revised budget has been incorporated into the CEO ER and ProDoc.

Reference:

CEO Endorsement request, Part II, Annex E.

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

The environmental and social policies of UNDP have been applied and it has been determined that this project meets the exemption criteria as defined by UNDP's Social

and Environmental Screening Procedure, for projects that are mostly aimed at capacity building and coordination of global/regional programs with no country level activities.

Policy: https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/Lists/Announcements/DispForm.aspx?ID=2&ContentTypeId=0x01040085F49DCB13EF7A40BD8A151E94C4CBE7

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Item Cleared.

8/25/2021, FB:

Yes, a project result framework is included.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request **N/A**

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared.

FB, 07/15/21:

Please include a table listing all comments provided by Council at PFD approval stage. For those not 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

Agency Response
CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. A table with the Council comments has been included in the CEO Endorsement request, Annex B.

Reference:

Annex B in the CEO Endorsement request.

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared.

FB, 07/15/21:

Please include a table listing all comments provided by STAP at PFD approval stage. For those not relevant to this child project, please clearly indicate so. STAP comments are available here:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10413_STAP_screen.pdf

Agency Response
CG_11th October 2021

Incorporated. A table with the Council comments has been included in the CEO Endorsement request, Annex B.

Reference:

Annex B in the CEO Endorsement request.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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 N/A - A PPG was not requested for this Regional Child Project.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Item Cleared.

A project Map is provided.

Agency Response
Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A - this is a Regional Project, therefore no country OFP approval is required.

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

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/14/2021: CEO ER is being recommended for technical clearance, after PPO round of comments.

10/14/2021: CEO ER is being recommended for technical clearance.

8/24/2021: Not at this time - Agency is requested to address the comments provided and to resubmit.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/13/2021	

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Regional Child Project of the GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program (AMP) is a key component of the program itself as it includes coordination platforms, monitoring and knowledge management components that are central to the program's success. The AMP is fully aligned with the CCM programming directions. The AMP's objective is to increase access to electricity, and reducing baseline carbon emissions, by improving the financial viability and promoting scaled-up commercial investment in renewable energy minigrids. The programmatic approach aims to achieve greater impact by creating new minigrid markets across the continent, to create scale and momentum, attracting private sector interest and investment. The programmatic approach will also allow for a broader sharing of good practice, and create economies of scale in providing program services. The program has been designed to specifically address the niche of cost-reduction, and in this way be complementary to existing baseline activities supporting minigrid investment in Africa. The program includes a cohort of 17 national projects and 1 regional project. These include 14 GEF-funded AMP child projects and 4 third party funded national projects.

The AMP Regional project's objective is to support countries to scale up commercial investment in low-carbon minigrids, acting as the knowledge, advocacy and coordinating platform for the AMP. This will be achieved through a suite of knowledge tools, technical and operational expertise, communities of practice, and promoting innovative digital approaches for minigrid cost-reduction. The Regional child project is structured across five components: (i) knowledge tools for both public and private actors; (ii) tailored technical and operational assistance to countries; (iii) communities of practice, (iv) digitalization for minigrid cost-reduction, and (v) M&E. The GEF-7 Trust Fund allocation for the regional project is USD 3,525,900. A further USD 37,960,000 in co-finance have been committed by a range of sources. The AMP as a whole is expected to generate 347,567 tCO_{2e} of direct emissions reductions from the renewable minigrid investments made by all its national projects and 27,329,016 tCO_{2e} of indirect emission reductions as a result of an enabled investment environment. The AMP Regional project

is expected to generate 30,433 tCO₂e of direct emissions reductions from the renewable minigrid investments made by AMP ?third-party-funded? national projects. It is also expected to generate 8,467,145 tCO₂e of indirect emission reductions associated to the project?s contribution to an enabled investment environment for minigrid scale-up.