



Nation child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program_ Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11043

Countries

Congo DR

Project Name

Nation child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program_ Democratic
Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/22/2023

Review completed by PM

12/17/2023

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

Yes. The project is aligned with the CCM Focal Area.

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
1/17/2024 PM:

4+5. Cleared.

12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

4+5. No. This hasn't been corrected yet. Output 4.4 shall be replaced by 3.4 and "Output" shall be added before 4.4. Please amend accordingly.

6. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. The expected implementation start and completion dates shall be revised to a later date;
2. The executing agency for the project is the Ministry of Energy as per the info provided in the first page of the CEO Endorsement. As per the budget table, the executing agency is ANSER. We understand ANSER is part of the Ministry of Energy, but please to the extend possible try to use the same terminology across the document, i.e. either Ministry of Energy or ANSER or ANSER, Ministry of Energy.
3. In Table B under the components column please replace Output 3.3. by Component 3;
4. Please revise Component 3 under Table B. The following seems to have been copied/pasted by mistake: "4.4 Engage with the regional AMP project, via (i) Communities of Practice and (ii) capturing and sharing lessons learned".
5. Likewise in the outputs column for Component 4, Output 4.4. shall be replaced by Output 3.4.
6. The GEF team noticed that neither PMC nor M&E costs are charged to GEF funding. Instead these costs would be covered by the co-financing resources. However, it seems the proposed child project will have its own PMU, separate from the UNDP PDL-145T PMU. If this is correct, could you please clarify how will UNDP ensure co-financing from PDL-145T project will be indeed used to cover the PMC and M&E costs for the AMP DRC child project? Under the PDL-145T project, does UNDP have accountability/responsibility in the selection of the PMU staff?

Agency Response

CG 17/01/2024

"Output" has been added before 4.4 and 4.4 has been replaced by 3.4.

CG 14/12/2023

1. Implementation and completion dates have been revised to a later date.

2. We would like to clarify that the executing agency is Agence Nationale de l'Electrification et des Services Energétiques en milieux Rural et Periurbain (ANSER) and not the ministry. At the stage of the submission of the project concept note (PIF), the executing agency was the ministry MRHE. During the project preparation phase, it was decided that ANSER would be more suitable as the executing agency. This decision was based on the overall alignment of the ANSER's mission as a rural electrification agency with the AMP child project's goals and the direct involvement of ANSER in the PDL-145T project with which the AMP child project is now closely aligned. Please note the CEO Endorsement Request has been revised to avoid any confusion.

3. The table has been revised.

4.+5. There was a mistake in Table B. Output 3.4 was numbered incorrectly which has now been revised.

6. The budget has been revised to ensure that both GEF funding and UNDP TRAC co-financing are allocated to cover the project's PMC and M&E costs.

Indeed, the proposed AMP national child project will have its own PMU, separate from the UNDP PDL-145T PMU. And the PMC costs of the AMP national child project will be fully covered by the GEF grant and the UNDP TRAC co-financing.

We would like to clarify the sources and types of co-financing include:

? The UNDP Country Office in the DRC is directly financing a portion of the project activities with \$500,000 (UNDP TRAC funding). These resources are part of the total project budget administered by UNDP. The total funding available for the AMP child project's activities, including the GEF Grant and the UNDP TRAC co-financing, is thus \$908,716.

? The described co-financing of \$60,050,000 for the UNDP-led PDL-145T activities is not part of the total project budget administered by UNDP and is not used to fund any of the AMP child project's activities. The UNDP-led PDL-145T project has its own PMU and its own budget. Its activities include the development and construction of minigrids, and these investments have been included as co-financing of the AMP child project because they serve to demonstrate cost reduction and a specific minigrid delivery model that could be scalable through DRC, particularly in remote hard-to-reach areas of the country. However, these investments are managed by the separate UNDP-led PDL-145T project.

Finally, the selection of the PMU staff of the UNDP-led PDL-145T project has been made in line with UNDP policies and procedures.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/11/2023 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

12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. The timeframe from the Letter of Co-financing from the AfDB has already passed, i.e. 2018-2022. Please clarify and provide evidence as need be that the co-financing resources are still available in 2023.

For the 3rd round AMP National Projects

African Development Bank through Sustainable Energy Fund for Africa (SEFA)	DRC Green Mini-Grids support Programme	USD 998,000	Grant	2018-2022
--	--	-------------	-------	-----------

2. The Letter of Co-financing for the \$500k grant from UNDP (TRAC) is missing. Please upload.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. AfDB has informed us that there is a US\$592,000 balance outstanding to be deployed in 2024. The email has been included in Annex 13 with the respective co-financing letter.
2. The co-financing letter for the UNDP TRAC co-financing was indeed missing and has now been uploaded to the 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
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared. The PFD is being updated by the GEF IT team.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Child project's financing table has \$2 less in fee than in the PFD's:

PFD's financing table:

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Burundi	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation			0.00
UNDP	GET	Congo DR	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	408,716	36,786	445,502.00
UNDP	GET	Liberia	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation			0.00
UNDP	GET	Mali	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	458,329	41,249	499,578.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					867,045.00	78,035.00	945,080.00

Child project's financing table:

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Congo DR	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	408,716	36,784	445,500.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)					408,716.00	36,784.00	445,500.00

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

We have reviewed this and identified a mistake in the PFD Agency Fee figure associated with the GEF Grant of US\$ 408,716. The PFD indicates the agency fee is US\$36,786 and the correct figure is (should have been) US\$ 36,784 as shown in the child's project financing table. The US\$ 36,784 figure corresponds to 9% of the GEF Grant amount and is in line with the total GEF STAR allocation of US\$500,000 requested by the GEF OFP in its LOE and which is comprised of (i) US\$ 50,000 in PPG funds with an associated agency fee of US\$ 4,500, and (ii) a GEF grant of US\$ 408,716 with an associated agency fee of US\$ 36,784.

Figure 1. Taken from the DRC GEF OFP Letter of Endorsement

Source de financement	Agence	Domaine focal	Preparation du projet	Montant (en US\$)		
				Projet	Frais de service	Total
FEM	PNUD	CC	50 000	402 500	47 500	500 000
Total ressources FEM			50 000	402 500	47 500	500 000

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

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Explain the reason for the increase in Core Indicator #6 between PFD and CEO Endorsement stage, i.e. direct emissions reductions of 10,678 tCO₂ eq at PFD versus 665,103

tCO₂ eq at CEO Endorsement, and indirect emission reductions of 2,155,161 tCO₂ eq at PFD versus 3,550,936 tCO₂ eq at CEO Endorsement;

2. Likewise, please explain the difference in the number of beneficiaries at PFD stage, i.e. 10,769, versus at CEO Endorsement stage, i.e. 342,168.

3. In the Core Indicator section, please add an explanation on the number of connections expected under the project pilots, and the connections expected post-project. There is an estimation in the spread sheet but further explanation on this and the assumptions made (for instance on the casualty factors) would help better understand the calculations.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1 & 2.

Differences between targets estimated at CEO endorsement phase and at PFD phase are explained in **Annex 12 ? GHG Emissions Reductions and Project?s target contributions to GEF-7 Core Indicators** (See Section 5 ?Differences with respect to PIF-stage targets?). The explanation is summarized below for ease of access.

Direct emissions reductions. For this AMP child project, the direct emissions reductions calculated at CEO endorsement (665,103 tCO₂) phase are significantly higher than those calculated at PFD phase (10,678 tCO₂ eq). The reason is that GHG ER at CEO ER phase have been estimated based on the total co-financing for minigrid investments made available under the PDL-145T (US\$ 43 million) which is orders of magnitude larger than the project budget and co-financing allocated to pilots at PFD phase (US\$743,123). The project as designed at CEO ER phase does not have an INV allocation; all project funding is categorized as TA and designed as enabler technical assistance project for ANSER to bring forth the intended impact of the co-financed PDL145T minigrid component.

Indirect emissions reductions. The indirect emissions reductions calculated at CEO endorsement (3,550,936 tCO₂ eq) phase are higher than those calculated at PFD phase (2,155,161 tCO₂ eq), however this difference is not as high as with direct GHG ER because indirect GHG ER are not a function of the project?s budget or the co-financing for minigrid pilots. Any difference between PFD and CEO ER phases is the result of having updated unelectrified population figures (based on the SDG7 Tracking progress Report 2023) and revised the minigrid electrification factor from 15% to 25%, to reflect a larger expected role for minigrids in DRC.

Number of beneficiaries. The number of beneficiaries calculated at CEO endorsement (342,168 people) phase is higher than that calculated at PFD phase (10,769 people). As with direct emissions reductions, the total number of beneficiaries is a function of the project?s budget and co-financing allocated to direct minigrid investments. This amount has gone from

US\$743,123 at PFD Phase (including US\$371,560 GEF & UNDP TRAC INV and an estimated US\$371,560 in co-financing from other sources) to a total of US\$43 million in the CEO ER phase (no GEF & UNDP TRAC INV, all of it is co-financing). As a result, the estimated number of minigrids that will be developed has increased from 22 to 135 resulting in a higher estimated number of beneficiaries.

3.

The CEO ER (namely section **F. Project's Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators?** under the indicators table) has been revised to provide further information on (i) the number of connections expected under the PDL-145T direct minigrid investments and (ii) the connections expected post-project which factor into the estimation of indirect GHG ER.

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
1/17/2024 PM:

Cleared.

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared with comments. Please remove agency footnotes/comments in the response below.

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. Please consider elaborating further on the estimated connections under the proposed project and the broader DPL-145T project. Provide the estimations used to calculate these connections as well as number of households still lacking energy access after project completion. This would provide a better idea of the challenge to be addressed. Some information on the connections expected to be achieved under the project have been provided in the GHG spreadsheet. However, no explanation has been provided on how these have been estimated.

Agency Response

CG 17/01/2024

The footnotes and comments have been removed from the response below.

CG 14/12/2023

The country context/overview in the ProDoc and CEO ER document, have been strengthened to provide a better idea of the challenge to be addressed.

A detailed explanation of how the number of connections expected to be achieved under the PDL-145T project were calculated can be found in **Annex 12 ? GHG Emissions Reductions and Project?s target contributions to GEF-7 Core Indicators**. A brief summary is shared here for ease of access:

The number of connections to be achieved by the minigrid pilots developed under the PDL-145T has been determined solely based on the availability of co-financing for minigrid investments, which is set at US\$43 million, and a series of assumptions described in some detail in **Annex 12**.

Since the specific minigrid systems sizing and configuration will be determined during the implementation of the PDL-145T, an indicative minigrid system has been used as a basis for estimating GHG ER and other results in line with the standard methodology applied for every other AMP national project. This indicative RE minigrid system is expected to have Solar PV and battery storage capacity of 89 kW and 217 kWh respectively, add 514 new connections (500 household customers, 2 social customers, 12 commercial customers), benefit a total of 2,544 direct beneficiaries, and result in 247 tCO₂e annual direct GHG ER (or 4,945 tCO₂e over a 20-year period).

Since the estimated CAPEX cost of each indicative minigrids system is US\$ 319,608, and the availability of co-financing for minigrid investments under PDL-145T is US\$ 43 million, the estimated number of minigrids that can be developed (covering 100% of CAPEX costs) is 134.5 minigrids. Considering each of these indicative minigrid systems comprises 514 connections, the total number of connections expected under the PDL-145T minigrid component is 69,133.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Please consider strengthen the outputs of Component 1, by for instance considering policy or regulation adoption to also make it more consistent with *Outcome 1: Stakeholder ownership in a national minigrid delivery model is advanced, and appropriate policies and regulations are adopted to facilitate investment in low-carbon minigrids;*
2. Likewise, for component 3 if possible please consider including "developing of a national digital strategy" instead of "recommendations for a national digital strategy";
3. Kindly check and revise the numbering for all the components and outputs since there seems to be several inconsistencies throughout the document. For instance, the QAMF under component 3 has been tagged as Output 1.1, shouldn't it be Output 3.3? See another example below:

3.3.4. Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

This component will contribute to ensuring compliance with all mandatory UNDP/GEF monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements, including the following: (i) conducting an inception workshop and preparing an inception workshop report, (ii) ongoing monitoring of the project, (iii) conducting a project Mid-Term Evaluation (MTR) at the half-way mark of project implementation; and (iv) conducting a project Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the implementation period. To that end, Component 5 includes a single output comprised of activities to meet each of the aforementioned requirements, which are described in more detail further below.

The AMP Regional Project will provide support to the project, through its PMU staff or by hiring or recommending subject matter experts, for the project to execute M&E activities such as the inception workshop, ongoing monitoring, and project evaluations. Further details provided in Section VI.

Component 2.

Output 2.1: M&E and Reporting, including (i) Conducting inception workshop and preparing report, (ii) Ongoing M&E, (iii) Mid Term Evaluation and (iv) Terminal Evaluation

This output includes the following activities:

Activity 2.1.1 Conducting inception workshop and preparing report. A project inception workshop will be held to officially launch the project and, among other aims, familiarize key stakeholders with the detailed project strategy, roles and responsibilities of the project team, and project planning instruments such as the Total Budget and Work Plan (Section IX), multi-year work plan (Annex 4), Monitoring Plan (Section VI), and the Procurement Plan (Annex 11), among others. The national inception workshop will be carried at the beginning of project implementation within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project. The workshop will be organized by the PMU with support from the IP, and planned with support from the UNDP CO and AMP

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

We have included additional information in the first part of the CEO ER document, in particular regarding the importance for this AMP project, as well as for others, of the concept of the "national dialogue on minigrig delivery models."

The main focus of Component 1 is on facilitating a national dialogue with various stakeholders, including government ministries, local authorities, communities, utilities, the private sector, and others based on the specific minigrig delivery model that will be used for the PDL-145T project and that government expects to pursue for electrification of remote rural areas with minigrigs.

Since this delivery model is based on public funding and ownership of minigrigs with private sector coming in on operations and maintenance, no specific needs were identified to develop or adjust specific policy and/or regulation to underpin the delivery model. Instead, ANSER will need capacity building and technical assistance to put in place procurement processes and contractual arrangements for the operation and maintenance of publicly owned minigrigs and to explore questions and aspects of the delivery model as needed.

2. The project will prepare recommendations for the development of a national digital strategy for the minigrigs sector. These recommendations will be informed by project activities related to digitalization including: (i) development and implementation of a digital strategy for the PDL-145T minigrigs component, (ii) procurement of digital platforms/tools, and (iii) develop standardized frameworks for monitoring minigrigs performance.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

Yes. The project is well aligned with the CCM Focal Area strategy related to decentralized power systems and energy access.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. This section needs to be strengthened. Please elaborate further on the project's incremental reasoning/contribution from the baseline taking into account that the GEF funds only the incremental or additional costs of alternatives clean technologies. This has been somehow explained earlier in the document, but need to be better reflected in here.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

Section 5 in the CEO Endorsement Request (Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions) has been revised to elaborate further on contribution from the baseline, and co-financing.

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

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. Please consider strengthening this section by adding more information on the Global Environmental Benefits of the project beyond GHG emission reductions, i.e. health and/or adaptation benefits, job creation, etc.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

Section 6 in the CEO Endorsement Request (Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)) has been revised to include more information on co-benefits arising from the project's interventions.

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
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. This section shall be further strengthened by for instance providing more information/calculations on the estimated number of connections under this project and the broader PDL-145T project, and the number of households still lacking energy access after project completion. This can give an idea of the potential for replicability and scale up in the country.

Agency Response
CG 14/12/2023

Section 7 ?Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up? in the CEO ER document, has been strengthened to provide a better idea of the scale-up potential given the nature of the development challenge addressed.

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
10/11/2023 PM:

Yes. A project map is provided, although exact location of minigrids to be financed will only be determined during project implementation.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes. Linkages with the AMP regional project are highlighted, both in terms of knowledge management and contribution to Core Indicators 6.

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

12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

4. Cleared.

5. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Considering the main component of the project is to build stakeholder ownership in a national mini-grid delivery model, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan lacks important details related to civil society engagement.

1. In the CEO Endorsement document please include a reference to the date when the stakeholder consultations took place.
2. If applicable, indicate if there are indigenous peoples in the project area.
3. Also, include a reference to the feedbacks received by the stakeholders consulted and how these comments have been taken into consideration.
4. Elaborate further on the specific civil society organizations/groups/associations that will be engaged as part of project implementation and their respective roles and responsibilities.
5. In components 1, 2 and 3, please consider elaborating further on the stakeholder engagement under the different outputs.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex to the ProDoc) was revised to include information on the stakeholder consultations held during the project design phase (including as applicable the respective attendance lists). Consultations included a Project Inception Workshop (held on 26 April 2023), a Project Validation Workshop (held on 21 July 2023), as well as various bilateral consultations held both in person and online (from May to July 2023).
2. The minigrid investments will be developed under the PDL-145T in compliance with UNDP SES as that project will be implemented by UNDP on behalf of the DRC government. A Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) has been completed for the PDL-145T and Standard 6 on Indigenous Peoples has been triggered based on the existence of groups that meet UNDP S6 criteria at the national level. However, since the specific minigrid sites remain to be confirmed, the presence of indigenous peoples in the minigrid pilots? areas will be assessed as part of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA), or its equivalent, that will be conducted once those sites are clearly defined.
3. The primary feedback from most stakeholders was the lack of coordination in the minigrid sector. Both public and private sector participants explained that there are many initiatives related to off-grid electrification and minigrids, but that these projects are often not coordinated among the relevant parties nor among each other. This feedback was incorporated and reflected in the design of the project as one of the main project activities, i.e., coordination among all levels of minigrid development for all stakeholders. Other feedback included the lack of sufficient incentives and the high risk for minigrids investment, the lack of clear regulations and processes and the resulting administrative burden both for the private and public sectors,

the lack of an electrification masterplan, and the lack of availability of data for sector and minigrid planning.

The relevant section of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been revised to reflect this information.

4. The executing agency will include civil society organizations or associations as part of the project board. At the moment no such organization or association could be identified, given that the siting of the 172 minigrids has not yet been fully determined. Once the siting is determined, the Executing Agency will engage with and select relevant organizations that can be part of the Project Board. Section 4 of the CEO ER has been revised to reflect this information.

5. Activity 1.1, the creation of multiple working groups to support sector-wide coordination on the PDL-145T project and to strengthen its implementation, will additionally serve as a forum to solicit feedback from stakeholders on the various activities of the AMP DRC Project. Based on the timelines of the various activities, feedback sessions will be set on the agendas of the various working groups to ensure stakeholders provide their input to strengthen the final design and implementation of the outputs. The description of Activity 1.1 has been revised to reflect this information.

Please note that Activity 2.1 serves to facilitate the exchange of information about the PDL-145T minigrids from the PDL-145T project to the AMP DRC Project. Therefore, it does not require the involvement of stakeholders.

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

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared. A separate gender action plan has been provided, which addressed the comments raised below.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. While the project has carried out a gender analysis, the action plan is scant and disconnected to the project components. Please elaborate further on the gender action plan, specifically as related to component 1, 2 and 3.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

The Gender Action Plan has been revised and the relevant sections updated in the CEO ER and ProDoc to reflect the Gender Action Plan (Annex 10 to the ProDoc). The following brief summary has been included in the CEO ER:

?A gender analysis was completed for DRC and a Gender Action Plan developed (Annex 10 provided as a separate document). The gender analysis considers existing gender-related institutions and policies by the government, including the main governmental body in charge of mainstreaming gender into the energy sector, the Gender, Energy and Development Cell (CGED) of the MRHE, which published the Practical Action Guide for Gender Mainstreaming in the Energy Sector in DRC; and the Gender Strategy and Gender Action Plan of ANSER, which aims to mainstream gender within ANSER?s governance, operations, and work culture and increase women?s access to energy in rural and peri urban areas. Based on analyses by these institutions and an assessment of gender risks related to the AMP DRC Project, it was identified that the lack of a clear and consistent gender mainstreaming strategy presents the greatest gender equality-related risk. As a result, the Gender Action Plan sets forth Gender Actions for each of the AMP DRC Project?s activities, ranging from the inclusion of integration of women?s organizations into the multi-stakeholder working group to reviewing the gender effects of subsidies in the PDL-145T minigrids.?

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

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Overall, this section shall be strengthened. Please consider adding more information on the interactions with the private sector during PPG activities.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

Section 4. Private Sector Engagement was developed further to elaborate on engagement of the private sector during the design phase of the project.

It's also important to note private sector will play an important role in the project. The project will focus on a delivery model based on public sector owning minigrids in rural areas, and private sector entities will be engaged for the operations and maintenance of these minigrids. Considering this role, minigrid developers have been identified early on and engagement initiated with the project's inception and validations workshops (See attendance lists included in the stakeholder engagement plan).

Other development partners working in DRC (e.g., IFC, WB, GEAPP) are focusing on a private-sector led delivery model for electrifying urban areas. They are also working closely with ANSER on consolidating this model. Despite the differences in the delivery models pursued, the project will engage with these development partners and participate in the working groups they lead to ensure proper exchange of information and coordination as needed between these two delivery models that government is pursuing to address different electrification challenges.

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

12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Consider elaborating further on the risk to revert to diesel operated gensets.
2. Please elaborate risks that the deployed mini-grids will be discontinued before its lifetime (20 years) as well as that the batteries and other equipment will not be properly replaced during the lifetime.
3. Please elaborate environmental risks of disposal of used batteries, solar panels, power converters, and other grid equipment.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. Although the project will not be funding the development of minigrid pilots as such (minigrid investments will take place through government co-financing through a separate project, the PDL-145T), the risk of reverting to diesel operated gensets will be mitigated by the AMP national child project by providing support to ANSER to set-up operations and maintenance (O&M) contracts with private operators. O&M contracts will ensure the provision of clean, affordable, and reliable power to end users once the PDL-145T minigrids have been commissioned. Also, it's important to note that PDL-145T minigrids will only use renewable energy.

2. The risks that the deployed mini-grids will be discontinued before their lifetime (20 years) or that the batteries and other equipment will not be properly replaced will be mitigated through the operations and maintenance contracts for the minigrids. For context, the PDL-145T minigrid delivery model entails the development and commissioning of minigrids with public funds, whereas the operations and maintenance will be performed by private firms that are selected through competitive procurement. While the overall implementation mechanism for the minigrids has been determined by the government, the exact details need to be discussed and decided by the key actors, in particular ANSER, with technical assistance available through this project. The AMP child project is providing critical technical assistance to ensure that these details incorporate the latest best practices on minigrids from across the globe, including the mitigation of the risk that was mentioned.

The Project Risk Log in the Project Document as well as section 5. Risks in the CEO ER document have been revised to include this risk and an explanation on how this risk will be managed.

3. It is well noted that one of the key social and environmental risks of solar PV minigrids is related to the disposal of used batteries and equipment.

This risk has been identified in the SESP of the UNDP-led PDL-145T project and will be further assessed in the ESIA or targeted assessment that will be undertaken by the PDL-145T PMU for each minigrid pilot. The PDL-145T will also develop an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) which will include a Waste Management Plan detailing the procedures for disposal of all types of waste associated with construction and operation of the pilot minigrids. The plan will include procedures for assessing the hazardous nature of the e-

waste and propose appropriate measures for end-of-life measures, encouraging recycling whenever possible.

The Project Risk Log in the Project Document as well as section 5. Risks in the CEO ER document have been revised to include a risk under Category 6 (Regulatory) related to potential deviations from UNDP internal rules and regulations, namely, UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES). This considers environmental and social risks that could materialize, associated with the co-financed minigrid investments implemented under PDL-145T and describes relevant mitigation actions that will be undertaken by the project, as well as by the PDL-145T.

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
12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. Please address/clarify the following comments:

1. Kindly note that as per the GEF jargon, the Ministry is the executing agency of this project and not the implementing partner as described in section "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination". Please update throughout the project proposal to avoid confusion with the implementing agency of the AMP, i.e. UNDP.

2. As per the CEO Endorsement document, there will be two separate Project Management Units (PMUs) one for the GEF project and another one for the DPL-145T project. Please elaborate further on this and explain the rationale for this decision. Given that the GEF funded project is relatively small (i.e. over US\$ 400k) and that it would very well complement the existing project, it seems more efficient in terms of resources to share the management unit with the broader project. Also, please address previous comment on having a PMU separate from the bigger project but fully funded by co-financing resources.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. The CEO Endorsement Request has been revised to refer to ANSER as the Executing Entity/Agency in line with GEF jargon. The UNDP ProDoc, however, refers to ANSER as the Implementing Partner in line with UNDP jargon.
2. The decision to have two separate Project Management Units (PMUs), one for the GEF project and another one for the PDL-145T project, was made for the following two reasons:

First, the timeline of both projects was not aligned to integrate the AMP child project into the PDL-145T project. When project preparation for the AMP national child began, the PDL-145T project was well underway and had already established the required governance structures to begin implementation. Given the broad mandate of the PDL-145T project with a budget of \$610 million and various components including the delivery of healthcare, schooling, road and other civil infrastructure, PMU-internal staff had been onboarded and processes had been established that made it difficult to later include the activities of the AMP national child project into the PMU's overall scope.

Second, the decision to create a separate AMP national child project will enable the project activities to continue throughout all of the PDL-145T project's implementation, including the phase where a UNDP-led PMU develops the minigrid pilots, and the phase where ANSER assumes responsibility for managing these minigrids. As elaborated in the project description, the implementation arrangement for the PDL-145T project specifies that the minigrids will be constructed and commissioned by UNDP (UNDP phase), after which custody of the minigrids will be transferred to ANSER, which will then be responsible for procuring private firms for their operations and maintenance (ANSER phase). Given the separation of the PDL-145T project's implementation in these two phases, a standalone AMP national child project is more effective as it can provide strategic support to both phases, where the integration of the AMP project into the PDL-145T project would have only allowed support under the UNDP phase.

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

10/11/2023 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
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comment:

- While there is a total budget figure provided for Components 3 and 4, there is no budget and timeline indicated for the proposed KM and communications activities mentioned within these components and others. Please update the table under the KM section to include key KM activities (and their timeline) under the project components.

Agency Response
CG 14/12/2023

The following clarification was added to the section 8. *Knowledge Management?* in the CEO ER document:

Table 7 presents an overview of the timelines of various project activities related to knowledge management. The activity with a primary focus on knowledge management is Output 3.4, Engagement with the regional project. As described above, a key aspect of the regional project is to collate and share knowledge across participant countries as well as support the development of the clean energy minigrid industry more broadly. This activity supports this objective. The total budget for Output 3.4 is \$21,000.

Table 7: Timeline of KM Activities

Outputs	Year 1 (2023/2024)				Year 2 (2024/2025)				Year 3 (2025/2026)				Year 4 (2026/2027)			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1.2: Minigrid DREI techno- economic analyses																
Output 3.1: Project digital strategy																
Output 3.2: Minigrids digital platform																
Output 3.3: QAMF																
Output 3.4: Engagement with regional project																
Output 4.1: M&E and Reporting																

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
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. As per the CEO Endorsement document, the M&E plan will be funded with the co-financing resources from UNDP TRAC Fund. However, the letter of co-financing from UNDP TRAC Fund is missing. Please provide the letter of co-financing or update the co-financing resources for the M&E Plan.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. The UNDP TRAC co-financing letter has now been uploaded to the portal. Also, the budget has been revised so that both GEF and UNDP TRAC funds are allocated to PMC and M&E.

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

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please see previous comment suggesting further elaboration on the global environmental benefits from the project beyond the GHG emission reductions expected.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

Section 6 in the CEO Endorsement Request (Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)) has been revised to include more information on co-benefits arising from the project's interventions.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/17/2023 PM:

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

4. Cleared.

5. Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. In the budget table in Annex E, under column "Responsible Entity" please use either ANSER or Ministry of Energy to make it consistent with the Executing Agency name included in the data page at the beginning of the CEO Endorsement (see previous comment on this).

2. Also in Annex E, please specify the role of the 1st international consultant in the list with a cost of US\$ 37,500.

3. Annex B "Responses to Project Reviews" is missing.

4. Annex A is off-margins. Please update.

5. The UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Procedures (SESP) uploaded as part of the CEO Endorsement document has not been signed off by the UNDP specialist. Please clarify this and/or upload a signed version.

Agency Response

CG 14/12/2023

1. As described above, the executing agency has changed from the ministry MRHE (as initially considered in the Concept) to ANSER (as now considered in the CEO ER). We have revised documents for consistency.

2. To further specify the role of the 1st international consultant (with a cost of US\$ 37,500) the following clarifications were included in the budget note to this line item in the Total Budget and Work Plan (TBWP) in the Project Document:

? ?1 international technical consultant to conduct DREI analysis, including interviews, financial models, and knowledge products (50 days, @ \$750/day)

? 1 national consultant to support international consultant with coordination and technical analysis (20 days, @ \$400/day)?

3. Comments on the PFD Addendum including the AMP DRC national child project are listed in the ?COMPILATION OF COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS ON THE GEF TRUST FUND JUNE 2022 WORK PROGRAM?. Please find the answers in Annex B which has now been uploaded in the GEF Portal.

4. Annex A content, has been copied/pasted again in the GEF Portal with special attention to the margins.

5. The SESP will be signed by the respective signatories, including the UNDP SES Specialist after CEO Endorsement and as part of the UNDP final approval and signature of the Project Document. At this stage, this Annex is typically uploaded without signatures but after an internal SES clearance milestone has been completed to enable submission of the project for GEF CEO Endorsement.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/11/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/11/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. See previous comment, Annex B "Responses to Project Reviews" is missing. 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 14/12/2023

Comments on the PFD Addendum including the AMP DRC national child project are listed in the ?COMPILATION OF COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS ON THE GEF TRUST FUND JUNE 2022 WORK PROGRAM? available here:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-08/GEF_C.62_Compilation_council_comments.pdf. Please find the answers below which have been included in Annex B and uploaded in the GEF Portal.

Annex B has now been included in the CEO ER document.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/17/2024 PM:

Cleared.

12/17/2023 PM:

Cleared, with comments. Please add the responses below to ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS of the CEO Endorsement document.

10/11/2023 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 needs to consider incentives for alternative livelihoods for people involved in diesel generator business.
2. What are the backups to prevent diesel generators from still being frequently used.

Agency Response

CG 17/01/2024

The responses below have been added in a new table titled **RESPONSES TO STAP COMMENTS PROVIDED AT THE PFD STAGE?** in ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS of the CEO Endorsement document.

CG 14/12/2023

1. During the stakeholder engagement process as part of the project's preparation, the diesel generator industry was not flagged by any stakeholder as a source of concern. Moreover, given the immense energy access challenge at hand in the DRC, diesel generators will continue to play an important role for those communities, businesses, and households which will not have the benefit of being selected for the development of a renewable energy powered minigrid.

Regarding incentives for people in the diesel generator business, the involvement of the private sector for both the construction and the operations and maintenance phase of the PDL-145T project present significant opportunities. Given the experience of the diesel generator business with off-grid communities and off-grid productive uses of energy, related professionals are uniquely suited to become familiar with solar-battery generation systems and use their knowledge regarding all other aspects of minigrid and off-grid energy development.

2. In the villages in which the PDL-145T minigrids will be deployed, it is assumed that all connected households and other consumers will no longer select to use diesel generators as the minigrid tariff will be competitive due to the 100% capital subsidy by the government. It is also worth noting that the PDL-145T minigrids will not include diesel as backup.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/11/2023 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
10/11/2023 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
10/11/2023 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
10/11/2023 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
1/17/2024 PM:

Cleared.

12/17/2023 PM:

No. Please address comments highlighted in blue above.

10/11/2023 PM:

No. Please address pending comments above and attached UNDP checklist for this project.

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