

Rural Electrification for Community Well-being in Burundi

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11888

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Rural Electrification for Community Well-being in Burundi

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/6/2025

Review completed by PM

4/17/2025

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

4/22, FB.

OP comments, 4/21:

1. Environmental and Social Safeguards/Key Risks: The environmental and social risk section of the Key Risks Table is classified as Moderate, and it is inconsistent with SESP attached. -->Please make this risk consistent with SESP, Substantial.
2. The financing table indicated CCM-1-2 while the PPG table CCM-1-1 as applicable for this project. There should be consistency in programming of funds between the financing table and PPG table. Please revise.

Cleared.

03/24, FB: Yes

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 22, 2025:

1. **Noted, and the necessary changes have been incorporated into the referenced section.**
2. **The PPG table now reflects the same programming direction as indicated in the financing table.**

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/16/24, FB

03/24, FB:

The project summary needs improvement. Please reorganized around 3 short paragraphs, including:

1. Description of the key problems, 2. Description of the proposed solution to address the problem, 3. Short description of each component (a sentence per component would be ok. A final sentence summarizing the key outcomes in terms of GEBs.

Please move the details on the implementation modality to later in the document (a section on implementation framework is missing ? see below in the review sheet).

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 17, 2025

1. Apologies, kindly note that the necessary changes have now been applied to the portal.

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

The project summary has been rewritten using the proposed three-point reorganization. This is done starting at the bottom of page 2 and continuing page 3 (reference page 2 ? 3)

The implementation modality text has been removed from the project summary, and moved to the section on implementation framework

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/17/24, FB

04/16/24, FB

1. Indicative Project Overview Table continue to show 2.1 and 2.3 as Investment. while this change was made in the Word version uploaded to the portal, they were not made in the portal live version of the document, and are therefore not visible in the review form. Please adjust.

2. The confirmation that no support for hybrid minigrids will be provided is well received.
Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Yes. However:

1. outputs 2.1 to 2.3 seems more adequately classified as TA instead of INV. Please consider adjusting.

2. Component 1 and 2 refer to renewable minigrids, while component 3 and 4 refer to ?low-carbon minigrids?. Why this differentiation? It needs to be clarified that GEF will not support hybrid grids that still employ diesel as backup.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. All outputs, including outputs 2.1 to 2.3, under Component 2 are now classified TA. This change is carried out in the Indicative Project Overview Table on page 4 (reference page 4)
2. The terms ?low-carbon? in outcomes 3 and 4 have been replaced by ?renewable?. It is confirmed that the project will not support hybrid minigrids. These changes have been brought in the Indicative Project Overview table on pages 5 and 7 (reference pages 5 and 7)

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/24, FB

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

03/26, OP:

The project indicated that it would apply a transformative approach to gender mainstreaming. To make sure that this would be the case, in the development of the project document, the Agency should adequately integrate gender equality considerations in the relevant project components, outputs and activities.

- 1) Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the RF.
- 2) In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please include specific budget lines, as appropriate and plans for monitoring and reporting on the GAP. Under M&E, please reflect that the reports to be submitted (MTR and TE) should include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.
- 3) In the knowledge management and learning component, please ensure that lessons learned and good practices on gender-transformative approaches and gender-specific results are captured and widely disseminated.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. Gender-specific indicators will be included in the RF at PPG stage. This text has been added under the section Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Section D on page 30 (reference page 30)
2. Under the Monitoring & Evaluation section, the following has been added: "Further, the MTR and TE will include gender-specific results and track progress in the implementation of the gender Action Plan (GAP)." This change is carried out on page 20 (reference page 20)
3. The following text has been added to the section on Knowledge management and Learning strategy: "Lessons learned and good practices on gender-transformative approaches and gender-specific results will also be captured and widely disseminated." This change has been carried out on page 22 (reference page 22)

In addition to the above, please note that the gender-dimension has also been stated in the reworded and reorganized Project Summary on page 3 (reference page 3)

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/24, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

The current situation is partially outlined and key barriers are identified. However, while the project's objective includes a strong focus on private developers (see objective: "promoting scaled-up commercial investment in renewable minigrids?"), there is no description of the current market dynamics for private developers/operators (if any), of the market outlook for such actors and description of key players. A more detailed analysis of these aspects seems necessary given the focus on private sector investments, including to substantiate the assumption that by addressing the listed barriers the private sector will fill in the existing gaps.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

The private sector energy dynamics has been reinforced in the section on situation analysis. For this a new sub-section "5. Private sector dynamics in rural electrification" has been added in the Project Rationale on pp.9-10 (reference page 9 ? 10)

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

A. Yes, different scenarios are presented, and the one selected is in line with the general GEF objectives in this area.

B. Yes, the proposed approach should be reasonably resistant to changes in the drivers.

C. The project builds on the structure of the GEF-UNDP Africa Minigrids Program, from which it borrows the main TOC, and proposed derisking approach and project structure.

D. See section below on stakeholders? engagement.

1. As Burundi is participating to large scale efforts in the region to boost energy access, including Mission 300, please explain how this project will complement other efforts already underway in the country.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

A. No action required.

B. No action required.

C. No action required.

D. Please note that this comment is addressed below at 5.3(c).

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/16/25, FB

03/24, FB:

1. Yes, the TOC is outlined. However, writing in the boxes is not legible. Please include a list of the drivers (as it was done for the assumptions) so that they can be read.
2. Proposed Components 2 and 3 seem to overlap and it is not entirely clear how they differ. They both refer to 'scale-up financing' or 'financial scale-up' that remains vague since there is no description or classification of the private sector actors that are being targeted. Please further differentiate descriptions and outputs of the two components, so that it is clear what each one will be financing.
3. in addition to the point above, the distinction between INV and TA is also blurred in both components, please clarify this too.
4. The stakeholder engagement table includes interesting information on the proposed share of MGs capital costs that would be covered by the GEF, as opposed to by the private developers. We would suggest including this information in the description of the intervention to be supported at component level, to make it more visible. Also, further analysis to justify such threshold (40/60%) should be provided at CEO ER.
5. Likewise, the section on Innovation/Transformation includes important information on how the project proposed to overcome some key barriers (investor's risk perception). Would suggest upfronting this information to the project description/TOC since it is not included there and the reader has to reach this section before being able to get this information.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. A list of drivers has been included in the section in TOC on pages 15-17.
2. Several steps have been taken to address this apparent confusion. To avoid any such confusion, the words 'financial scale-up' has been removed from the description of Component 3 that now reads 'Innovative Business Models with the private sector'. The word 'derisking' has been added in the description of Component 2 that now reads 'Scale-up derisking financing mechanism'. These changes does not alter the project design that is squarely aligned with other child projects of the AMP. Before explaining the further changes,

a point of clarification is brought to distinguish the 'financial scale up' alluded to in Components 2 and 3. Under the DREI framework, a basket of policy and financial derisking instruments are applied to incentivize private sector investments in renewables minigrids. The 'scale-up financing' referred to under Component 2 relates to ensuring sufficient financial flows for financial derisking instruments. When policy and financial derisking instruments are implemented, the theory of change suggests that private sector investments will be catalyzed, and this private flow of investment is referred to as 'financial scale-up' under Component 3. This private sector 'financial scale-up' relates to the 'innovative business model' based on cost-reduction levers.

Changes carried out:

- ? Description of Components 2 and 3: The changes in the descriptions of the 2 components have been carried out in the Project Overview Table on pp.4 and 5; pg.14 (both components); pg.17 (Component 2); pg.18 (Component 3); the TOC diagram in Figure 1 has also been updated.
 - ? Component 1: A line has been added on page 17 to highlight that proposed outputs to achieve outcome 1 are policy derisking instruments.
 - ? Component 2: The complementary use of policy and financial derisking instruments under the DREI framework, and the focus of Component 2 on establishing financial derisking instruments are highlighted on pg.18.
 - ? Component 3: Text has been added on pg.18 to explain the use of GEF Investment as a financial derisking instrument to incentivize private sector investments on solar PV minigrids.
3. With the changes explained above, the following changes have been carried out in the Project Overview Table on pp.4-6:
- ? Component 2 ? the entire component is TA only. This is aligned with the previous comment at 3(1) above.
 - ? Component 3 ? Only output 3.1 requires Investment (40% grant on Capex to incentivize 60% private sector investment); and the remaining outputs are TA.
4. This has been carried out with the revised text for Component 3 on page 18.
5. Since the TOC comes before the description of project components, the proposed changes have been carried out in the TOC section on page 13. In the new text, the DREI TOC is described and the nomenclature of policy and financial derisking instruments, and the compensation of risks is described. This therefore become the prelude to the new text that has been added to describe components 1, 2 and 3 in Project Description as mentioned above.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/16/25, FB

03/24, FB:

The incremental cost reasoning is applied briefly in the definition of the baseline and no-project scenarios. The GEF-supported project scenario is described.

However, it is not clear how the incremental cost principle is applied to the INV component. Particularly, please clarify how the GEF contribution to the capital cost of the 4 minigrids included in the INV component is calculated.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

Changes added on pages

? Component 3, page 18

5.2 Incremental/Additional Cost Reasoning

The incremental cost reasoning is framed around the GEF's role in enabling a shift from a business-as-usual trajectory?characterized by continued low rural electrification and reliance on fossil fuels?to a low-carbon development pathway based on renewable minigrids.

Business-as-Usual (No-Project Scenario):

Without GEF support, investments in rural electrification in Burundi would remain limited and continue to rely heavily on thermal generation or donor-led grant-financed minigrids (e.g., UMUCO WITERAMBERE project). While some donor initiatives exist, these do not address the structural barriers that deter scaled private investment in renewable minigrids, including high perceived risks, lack of cost-reflective tariffs, and insufficient capacity among local developers and financial institutions.

GEF Alternative:

The GEF-supported scenario leverages UNDP's DREI framework to introduce both policy and financial de-risking instruments and provide targeted capital subsidies for four solar PV-battery minigrids (totaling 540 kWp). These interventions are designed to test and de-risk commercially viable business models that integrate productive energy use and cost-reduction levers, thereby enabling replication and scale-up via private investment.

Application of Incremental Cost Principle to Component 3 (INV):

The GEF's contribution under Component 3 is focused on co-financing the capital cost of four minigrids in remote areas unlikely to attract purely private investment in the short term. The project explicitly plans to subsidize up to 40% of the CAPEX for these minigrids. This percentage was determined based on:

- ? Initial CAPEX estimates from similar installations (including UMUCO WITERAMBERE),
- ? Site selection in particularly underserved and high-risk rural areas,
- ? The need to pilot innovative business models with lower financial risks for private developers.
- ? The remaining 60% of the capital cost is expected to be mobilized from private sector equity and debt (e.g., KAZE Green Economy and its partners) as well as in-kind contributions from ABER and MINHEM. This structure illustrates a classic incremental cost scenario: GEF funds cover the part of the investment that specifically enables global environmental benefits (GHG mitigation via renewables vs. diesel), while co-financing addresses broader development needs.

Global Environmental Benefits:

The project will avoid an estimated 11,527 tCO₂e in direct emissions and 69,160 tCO₂e in indirect emissions, primarily through displacing diesel generation and deforestation-based biomass energy. These would not be achieved in the absence of GEF's incremental support to renewable-based systems.

Summary:

The project uses GEF resources to:

- ? Shift investment from fossil-fuel-based systems to renewable energy minigrids,

- ? De-risk private sector engagement through technical assistance and financial instruments,
- ? Generate global environmental benefits not attainable through baseline funding alone.
- ? A more detailed breakdown of the incremental cost calculation?including percentage of CAPEX supported, projected avoided emissions per minigrid, and rationale for subsidy levels?will be finalized at the CEO endorsement stage, with guidance from the AMP methodology and DREI risk pricing.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/16/25, FB

03/24, FB:

A) A dedicated section including information on the proposed implementation framework is missing in the section on ?Coordination?. Some details are proposed in the project summary regarding the proposed NIM implementation. Please include a more detailed description of the structure, including the proposed executing entity and modality of engagement with other national actors.

B) the section related to Cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects? include good amount of details on ongoing initiatives, however there is no mention of how this project will interact with those. More details need to be compiled at PPG stage in this. Also, we note that the project ?Solar Energy in Local Communities Project? financed by the world bank with a 100 M IDA grant, which has the objective of financing 45 minigrids, is not mentioned. It would be good to understand what coordination structures exist within the GEF?s project executing entity and this large grant.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

A. A new section titled 'Implementation framework' has been added on page 23 to describe the project implementation modality, including the use of technical working groups from including project partners in project implementation and ownership.

B. Although the suggestion is to provide more details at PPG stage, preliminary text has been added in the section titled 'Coordination with parallel initiatives' starting on pages 24 and 25.

The 'Solar Energy in Local Communities Project' has been added to the list of parallel initiatives on page 24.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB:

1. It is noted that the Agency has not used the national grid emission factor to calculate emission reductions. This is acceptable since in the absence of the project the underserved targeted users would likely have been connected through diesel-powered decentralized grids. A replication factor of 6 is also noted. A more detailed analysis is requested at CEO ER, including additional substantiation for such a seemingly high factor.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. It is highly unlikely that the national grid will soon reach 98% of the rural population that is without electrification. In this case, the alternative technology is correctly assumed to be thermal minigrids.

A detailed calculation of indirect ER will be carried out at PPG stage, and it will make use of the methodology adopted by AMP child projects.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Identified risks are presented in the risk table and proposed mitigation measures are identified. However, some of the ratings are not consistent with those listed in the SESP:

1. Climate risk is listed Low, while it is moderate in the SESP
2. The overall risk level from the SESP is "substantial": this is not reflected in the Social & Env risk category of the PIF's risk table.
3. the overall risk rating in the PIF is listed as Moderate, while the SESP (which includes several areas of overlap with the PIF Risk Table) is listed as Substantial. Consider revising the PIF table accordingly. Alternatively, please provide an explanation of how the rating was ranked as "moderate".
4. OP Comment: Considering that Burundi is listed as Institutional and social fragility country in the World Bank Group's FY25 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, it is critical to identify the most vulnerable population in the project area and map any impact on these population groups, including gender-based violence. Please elaborate further on how these additional circumstances have been taken into account.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. This has been changed on page 2 to Moderate to match the SESP assessment.
2. This has been changed on page 25 to substantial to reflect the SESP (reference page 28)
3. The overall risk rating has been increased to 'Substantial' in the PIF Risk Table on page 28
4. Given Burundi's classification as a fragile and conflict-affected country by the World Bank, the project will apply a conflict-sensitive lens during implementation, particularly in areas with high vulnerability and marginalization. Specific risks to vulnerable groups will be mapped and addressed through targeted safeguards during the PPG phase. This has been added to the social and environmental risks section.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB:

The project is designed in line with the Regional GEF *Africa Minigrids Programme*, from which it draws the key elements related to the theory of change, proposed financial and business model innovation and the approach to promote private sector engagement, scale up and durability. Additional elements related to the complementarity of the project with existing initiatives will have to be further developed at PPG.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

No Action Needed.

Please note that the additional text given on pages 24 and 25 under 'Coordination with parallel initiatives' clearly mentions that additional analysis will be carried out at PPG stage to seek complementarity.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Yes, the project is fully aligned with Objective 1.2 of the CCM programming directions:
?Enable the transition to decarbonized power systems?.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Yes, the project is aligned with the country priorities to extend access to energy to rural populations, as well as with the country commitments to decarbonization as detailed in their NDC.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

Yes, the section is completed. However, the Overall project Risk Classification in this section (High or Substantial) is not consistent with the one provided in the risk table (Moderate). Please adjust accordingly to the correct rating.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

The answers in the stakeholders consultation section are not consistent: it is said that different categories of stakeholders were consulted, but also that names of those consulted were not yet identified. Please clarify and correct.

Stakeholder Engagement

We confirm that key stakeholders were consulted during PIF development as required per GEF policy plan to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement has been clearly articulated

Yes

Were the following stakeholders consulted during project identification phase:

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities: Yes

Civil Society Organizations: Yes

Private Sector: Yes

Provide a brief summary and list of names and dates of consultations

They have not yet been identified at this stage.

(Please upload to the portal documents tab any stakeholder engagement plan or assessments that phase.)

2. OP Comment: Please provide information of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and Civil Society Organization and how results of consultations were integrated into the project concept. Please provide information of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and Civil Society Organization and how results of consultations were integrated into the project concept.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

Consultations with IPLC on 23, January 2025 in Gitega

Consultations with private sector and Civil society and cooperative representative on 24, January 2025 in Gitega

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/24, FB:

1. Please select CCM 1.2 instead of 1.1.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

The proposed change has been made to Annex A of the PIF.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

We look forward to receiving the additional information indicated below, at CEO ER stage.

03/24, FB:

1. The bulk of the cofinancing is coming form Kaze Green Economy. Information on this firm is scarce on line, please provide more details on the partner. Also, please provide additional information on the type of *?loans?* co-financing have been discussed with this partner and how such amount have been estimated.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

Two additional big projects have been identified and at the PPG stage, we will confirm the co financing arrangements with those projects mentioned below:

? The Nyakiriza Solar Project (IDA-World Bank), with \$44 million allocated to electrify health centers and provide solar kits.

? The Rural Electrification of 2000 Hills Project led by WEZA POWER, a \$1.4 billion PPP with a \$60 million pilot phase underway.

Kaze Green Economy is a private sector company operating in Burundi which seeks to promote well -being of rural communities in Burundi through energy transition from wood energies to electric and renewable cooking solutions. A detailed due diligence will be conducted at the PPG stage to assess its suitability to partner on the project.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB: Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

04/16/25, FB - Cleared.

03/26, OP:

The letter of endorsement (LoE) is signed by the Political Focal Point (H. E. Minister Eng. Prosper Dodiko), not by the Operational Focal Point (Eng. Emmanuel Ndorimana). Please ask the Agency to obtain a new LoE signed by the OFP.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

The OFP has signed the LOE and it will be compiled as a single document.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

see above comment.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/17/24, FB

04/16/25, FB

1. There is no justification for the use of 1 for adaptation. Please revise to 0.

03/24, FB:

1. the project does not have adaptation objectives, nor specific outcomes, so adaptation should be 0, unless 1 can be substantiated (it would not appear so).

2. LD and BD are listed as significant objectives, yet there is no mention of LD or BD in the theory of change, activities or expected target indicators. Unless more substantial justification is provided, these should too be listed as 0.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, April 17, 2025

The requested change is now applied to the adaptation rio marker.

UNDP Response, April 14, 2025

1. This has been changed to one.
2. This has been changed to zero as advised.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/24, FB: Yes, a taxonomy is provided.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

04/22/25, OP - The Agency is required to address last 2 remaining comments in the review sheet

04/17/24, FB: The Agency addressed the comments in the review sheet - The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

03/24, FB:

Not at this stage. The Agency is requested to make the requested amendments and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

1. Gender specific indicators need to be included in Result Framework during PPG stage and presented in the CEO ER.
2. Further elaboration will need to be carried out during PPG stage in relation to the cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects.
3. Recognizing Burundi's classification as fragile and conflict-affected country, specific risks to vulnerable groups will be mapped and addressed through targeted safeguards during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/24/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/16/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/17/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		