

Promoting clean energy technologies for sustainable start-ups and small medium enterprises development in Nigeria

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10825

Countries

Nigeria

Project Name

Promoting clean energy technologies for sustainable start-ups and small medium enterprises development in Nigeria

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

10/12/2021

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Oct 18, 2021: Comment cleared.

Oct 11, 2021: Please keep all outcomes and outputs under one line for each component (Component title should be only one description). There are three separate lines under component 1 while component 2 has only one line that includes all the outcomes and outputs.

Yes. The changes on outcomes and outputs and justifications are provided under Part II of the CER document.

Agency Response

15 October 2021

The format of the table is unfortunately not completely flexible. Some Component and Outcome titles have been deleted so that they are now only shown once. Output 1.1.3 is now together with 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. It is however not easy to properly fit multiple Outcomes under the same Component, therefore a line per Outcome has been left in the table. In addition, it is not possible to select multiple Component types (i.e TA and INV at the same time. It was, therefore, necessary to Separate 1.2.4 from the rest of the Outputs under Outcome 1.2.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Oct 18, 2021: Comments cleared.

Oct 11, 2021: Please address the below comments.

On the UNIDO co-financing: there is a little typo in the paragraph when explaining how Investment Mobilized was identified. It stipulates that UNIDO will provide \$50,000 in grants but per co-financing letter and Table C the grant is \$35,400. Please correct.

On the co-financing from Co-Creation Hub: given the information provided on their website, this co-financier should be categorized as "Other" rather than "Private Sector."

July 20, 2021: Co-financing letter from Federal Ministry of Science and Technology dated June 9, 2021 referred to a project does not match the title of this project. Please explain why the new letter did not provide the amount of co-financing and rather mentioned the old letter that referred to a GEF-6 project. Please provide additional letter that demonstrates the amount and the nature of the co-financing.

Agency Response

A new co-financing letter has been secured and uploaded onto the portal (see Annex M).

15 October 2021

Typo in the co-financing paragraph corrected to read " UNIDO will provide a grant in the amount of \$35,400 ..." in line with the co-finance letter and Table C.

The co-financing from Co-Creation Hub marked as "Other".

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 Yes.

Agency Response
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 No PPG requested.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Oct 11, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: The indicator 6 targets are the same as at the PFD. Please elaborate the rationale of the ratio of men and women on Indicator 11.

Agency Response Information on the rationale of the ratio of men and women on Indicator 11 has been included under the Core Indicators section.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Oct 11, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: Please elaborate the nature of co-financing in particular those are not in-kind contributions.

Agency Response Further information on the nature of co-financing has been included under (i) 'Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing for the Project by Name and by Type' and (ii) paragraph 97.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Oct 11, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: Please include the role of knowledge management in supporting sustainability and scaling up

Agency Response

A note on the role of knowledge management has been added to paragraph 134 on supporting sustainability and to paragraph 135 on supporting scaling up.

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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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 Yes, with Annex on stakeholder engagement plan.

Agency Response

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 Yes with Annex on gender action plan.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

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

Oct 11, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: The global PEE's support and its budget is not clear in terms of the necessity and the consistency with GEF's guidelines. UNIDO also cannot charge any costs except M&E. Please address these. Also, please add coordination with non-GEF initiatives and other global and national child projects of GCIP, as appropriate.

Agency Response

- The global PEEs involvement in GCIP Nigeria will be on a subcontracted basis to the national PEE. The specific potential services provided are detailed throughout the project description. A note has been added to paragraph 164;

-Only M&E is now charged to UNIDO and other costs have been re-assigned to the PEEs;

-Also, additional coordination with non-GEF and GCIP child projects has been added in paragraph 170.

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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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

Oct 11, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: Please clarify if workshops and monitoring progress of result framework and gender indicators are envisaged while relevant budget is already incorporated in relevant budget lines.

Agency Response

Monitoring of the results framework and gender indicators is included and budgeted within the project. It is envisaged that the regular progress monitoring against the results framework and gender indicators would include workshops as part of the PSC meetings to discuss the results, risks and way forward. A sentence has been added to paragraph 195.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Oct 11, 2021: We note the revised budget table with ToRs. Comments cleared.

Yes. Please explain which document is the main ProDoc (as stipulated in GEF Policy) for this project other than annexes. Also, on budget table, please remove UNIDO?s budget except MTR and TE and other parties? budget except national executing entities.

Agency Response

- The main ProDoc refers to the project document itself, which is the CEO Approval Request document uploaded in the portal;
- Only M&E is now charged to UNIDO other costs have been re-assigned to the PEEs;
- Other parties except the national executing entities have been removed from the budget table. The Budget table has been updated and re-uploaded. In addition, a condensed table has been added to the Excel annex and copied into the main ProDoc, in order to make it more reader-friendly;
- Additional annexes have been added: the TORs of the Project Management Unit (PMU), consisting of a Project Coordinator and a Project Assistant. This has been done to justify the utilisation of GEF funds for the PMU salaries, as detailed in the budget table.

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 Yes with Annex on ESMP.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Oct 11, 2021: We note that other child projects also do not have mid-term targets.

Comment cleared.

July 20, 2021: Please explain the rationale of not having mid-term targets. Please clarify if all knowledge products are included.

Agency Response

Please elaborate on the above comment. Annex A, Project Results Framework has been uploaded as an attachment and copied within the CEO document.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

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
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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Oct 18, 2021: Comments cleared.

Oct 11, 2021: Please address comments on Table B and co-financing.

July 20, 2021: Not at this stage. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**1SMSP CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review (as
necessary)**

**Additional Review (as
necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations