

GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program

GEF Secretariat Review for Program Framework Document (PFD) entry – GEF - 7

Basic Information

GEF ID

10804

Countries

Regional (Chad, Mauritania, Benin, Mali, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Zambia)

Project Title

GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6662

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This comment is cleared.

rev. 05/04/21, FB

PPO Comments 04/20/21:

In Program Information the Agency needs to select 'yes' in "Other Program"

This item is GPU cleared.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

1. cleared.

2. cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Yes, the Program, through the submission of the PFD Addendum, remains aligned to the focal area strategy.

Please address the following aspects:

1. Agencies: AfDB is listed as Agency but there is no child project in the Addendum for which they are implementing agency. Please clarify the role of the AfDB in this addendum, and list them as "other executing partners" if that is accurate. There is also confusion on this in the description of many of the child project concepts, which reference to the AMP as "led by" UNDP, AfDB and RMI. This should be clarified.

2. Rio Marker for climate mitigation should be "2" (mitigation as principal objective), instead of "1" (significant contribution to mitigation).

Agency Response

4 May 2021

The portal has been updated selecting 'yes' in 'Other Program'

April 15, 2021

1. 1.- AfDB is no longer listed as Agency under Part I: Program identification in the PFD Addendum. We have also removed the language (referring to the program being led by UNDP, RMI and AfDB) from all concepts for 2nd round national child project. AfDB's role within the program is. AfDB's role in regards to this PFD Addendum is solely as co-financing provider for the Sao Tome & Principe, and Niger child projects.
2. The Rio marker has been changed from "1" (significant contribution to mitigation) to "2" (mitigation as principal objective).

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 05/04/2021 - FB

1. Cleared. PMC limit has been cleared with PPO via email, up to 10% allowed since all child are MSPs. Agency will consider PMC proportionality in the development of the child projects.

PPO Comments - 04/20/21:

1. PMC is 9.96% of the GEF Financing – per Guidelines, PMC for Programs cannot go beyond 5%. Please adjust. Once adjusted, please consider the policy on proportionality between GEF and co-financing resources allocated to PMC

consider the policy on proportionality between GEF and co-financing resources allocated to PMC.

This item is GPU cleared.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

04/12/2021 - FB

Yes, the components included in Table B are appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program's objectives. However:

1. Proportionality between GEF and co-finance for the PMC costs. Please ensure adequate consideration of this GEF policy is given in the further development of the child projects (see for instance the cases of Mali and Niger).

Agency Response

April 15, 2021

In further developing national child projects during the PPG Phase, UNDP will take this policy into consideration when confirming the co-financing sources and their allocation to different project components and PMC.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 05/04/2021 - FB

1. Cleared.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

1. Please note that the last row of Table C (Benin/GIZ) is inconsistent in PFD and in Child project concept. It should be investment mobilized in both instances, but it is "in kind" in the PFD. Please revise.

Government		Investment Mobilized	
GEF Agency	(Zambia) UNDP	Grant	Investment mobilized 150,000.00
Donor Agency	(Benin) GIZ	In-kind	Investment mobilized 120,000.00
Total Program Cost(\$)			142,962,000.00
Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified			
Notes: The Chad and Mauritania 'self-financed' national child projects, with UNDP TRAC funding, are represented in the program's finances as 'co-financed'.			
GEF Agency	(Zambia) UNDP	Grant	Investment mobilized 150,000.00
Donor Agency	(Benin) GIZ	In-kind	Investment mobilized 120,000.00
Total Program Cost(\$)			142,962,000.00
Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified			
Notes: The Chad and Mauritania 'self-financed' national child projects, with UNDP TRAC funding, are represented in the program's finances as 'co-financed'.			

04/12/2021 - FB

the level of co-financing is adequate at Program level, however:

1. The classification of the different streams of co-financing does not seem to follow the definition as per GEF policy in many instances. In particular, in several instances loans and grant are classified as recurrent expenses. This is also the case in some of the co-financing items in the child project concepts. Please revise all entries and ensure they are classified correctly (refer to GEF co-financing policy and project cycle guidelines).

Agency Response

4 May 2021

The Table C entry for Benin/GIZ has been updated in the Portal as well as in the PFD Addendum uploaded as an attachment.

April 15, 2021

UNDP has reviewed all entries and updated them based on the GEF co-financing policy (2018) and update of the project cycle guidelines (2020).

GEF Resource Availability

4. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 05/04/2021 - FB - Agency has been informed and has acknowledged this below in the review sheet.

PPO Comments - 04/20/21:

1. For Zambia: PPG + PPG Agency fee add up to \$54,500 – however, the current availability for Zambia is \$54,499.91. Please inform the Agency that by the time of requesting PPG, they need to request 1 dollar less, otherwise the validation will impede the submission.

This item is GPU cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Yes, the proposed GEF financing in Table D is in line with GEF policies.

Agency Response

4 May 2021

UNDP will request \$54,499 instead of \$54,500 PPG for Zambia.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

this is ok.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

this is ok.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

this is ok.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a to PFDs.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

04/12/2021 - FB

Core indicator 6 volumes are correctly reported in Table F.

However:

1. Please note that the term "consequential" emissions should be replaced with "indirect" throughout the document

1. Please note that the term "consequential" emissions should be replaced with "indirect" throughout the document.

2. we note that the relation between direct and indirect expected emission reduction varies significantly between countries, but there is no information to explain the differences in the assumptions. Please provide the calculation sheet with the key assumption available at this stage for the estimation of expected climate benefits.

Agency Response

April 15, 2021

1. The term "consequential" emissions has been replaced with "indirect" throughout the documents (PFD Addendum and national child project concepts).
2. The methodology used to estimate the direct and indirect emissions reductions for the 2nd round child projects is the same methodology used and described in the Original PFD. For ease of reference the description of the methodology used has been added to the PFD Addendum and the spreadsheet used to calculate direct and indirect emissions reductions will be uploaded to the GEF Portal with the re-submission of the PFD Addendum. Please also find a very brief explanation below of the reason why the relation between direct and indirect expected emission reduction can vary significantly between countries.

Indirect emissions reductions are not necessarily proportional to the size of the minigrid investments or the amount of direct emissions reductions for each project. In fact it is very likely that the relation between direct and indirect expected emission reduction varies significantly between countries depending mainly on the size of the electricity access gap that the project contributes to close by creating an enabled environment which subsequently attracts minigrid investment.

Indirect emissions reductions are a function of: (i) the size of the electricity access gap in each country (*key input: unelectrified population*), (ii) the extent to which minigrids can be expected to play a role in closing that access gap in each country (*key assumption: Minigrid electrification factor*), and (iii) the extent to which scaled-up electrification efforts to close electricity access gaps through minigrid deployment can and should be considered a result from the broader adoption of the outcomes of the AMP national and regional child projects (*key assumption: AMP causality factor*). Key assumptions have been arrived at relying on expert judgment regarding market potential and the nature of the AMP investments and activities that will contribute to future market potential and increased minigrid penetration in each country.

For countries where the size of the electricity gap is smaller, the ratio of indirect to direct emissions reductions could be orders of magnitude lower than for countries where there is a sizable unelectrified population. A case in point is Sao Tome & Principe which not only has a small total population (211,028) but also a relatively high electrification rate (71%), meaning the size of the minigrid opportunity is smaller than that for other countries. Therefore, even if its direct emissions reductions are the highest among the 2nd round countries - due to STP having the largest budget allocation to minigrid pilots – the indirect emissions reductions that can be expected from closing this relatively smaller electricity access gap are not only much smaller but the lowest among 2nd round countries.

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

The program taxonomy is provided.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

04/12/2021 - FB

The program justification/description remains in line with the approved PFD, and a new component of digital aspects of minigrid development and assessment is included and justified. However:

1. There are several changes in the components/outcomes that occurred in Table B (e.g. 1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 2.2 etc). Please include a table in the section on program description listing all changes, with a description of the new or revised outcomes "before" and "after", with a brief explanation of the changes and the reason why they were generated.

explanation of the changes and the reason why they were operated.

Agency Response

April 15, 2021

A table has been included in the section on program description listing, explaining and providing the reasoning behind all changes in the components, outcomes and outputs in Table B.

Changes to the overall set of components, outcomes, and outputs are the result of having developed during the PPG Phase for the 1st round of child projects, an updated 'AMP Harmonized Results Framework' for national child projects. Each national child project then selects outputs, outcomes, and relevant outcome indicators to include, with some adaptation, in their respective, tailored results frameworks. The 'AMP Harmonized Results Framework' for national child projects builds from the original PFD outcomes and outputs, but also reflects the latest thinking on the program and understanding of country contexts. The concepts for 2nd round national child projects were developed using this 'latest thinking', and therefore Table B of the PFD Addendum lists the updated set of outcomes and outputs.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

This is consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

This is consistent with the approved PFD. In addition, a new component to finance aspects related to the digitalization of minigrid development and data collection was added, and a description is included in the Regional Child Project Concept note attached to the PFD addendum.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

This is consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

This is consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Please note and address comment on core indicators above in this review sheet.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Yes, this is consistent with the approved PFD, and also enhanced by the introduction of a new component on digitalization of minigrid design, operation and monitoring.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Yes, a map is provided. Additional details on the location of the project sites in the several child projects will be requested at CEO ER stage for each one of the child projects.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/18/2021 - FB

04/12/2021 - FB

The table section on consistency with national priorities should include information on rural electrification plans and roadmaps, as well as the info on NDCs. Please either include such info or refer to the child project concept notes when the info is contained therein.

Agency Response

April 15, 2021

This has been addressed in the updated version of the PFD Addendum. Table 12 now lists such plans and roadmaps or equivalent information, quoting the child project concept notes.

knowledge management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD, as complemented by the new aspects related to knowledge management activities enabled by the new activities related to digitalization of minigrids.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

04/12/2021 - FB

Consistent with the approved PFD.

Agency Response

art III – 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

05/04/21 - FB:

1. All items cleared. The UNDP Checklist uploaded on the portal still includes Mauritania. But PM requested it via email and will upload the revised one as soon as possible in the portal.

04/20/21 - FB

1. LOE for Mauritania is missing. If by the resubmission no letter for Mauritania is included, the Agency needs to remove the child project from (a) Table 1: 2nd Round countries and national child projects; (b) Table 2: Overview of GHG Emission Reductions Expected from 2nd Round national child projects; (c) Table 3: Overview of direct beneficiaries from 2nd Round national child projects; (d) Table 6: Overview of increase in RE Capacity from 2nd Round national child projects; (e) Annex A – List of Child Projects under the Program; and (d) the compiled UNDP checklist included in the Document's tab.

2. Unofficial English translation for the Niger letter is missing. Please provide it in the portal.

04/12/2021 - FB

All LOEs for GEF funded projects have been provided, and duly signed by each country's OFP.

Agency Response

6 May 2021

1. The LOE for Mauritania has been received and included, together with its unofficial English translation, in the LOE PDF compilation.
2. Unofficial English translations for the Niger and Chad LOEs have been included in the LOE PDF compilation.

4 May 2021

1. The LOE for Mauritania was not received on time therefore the Mauritania child project has been removed from the PFD Addendum (including from: (a) Table 1: 2nd Round countries and national child projects; (b) Table 2: Overview of GHG Emission Reductions Expected from 2nd Round national child projects; (c) Table 3: Overview of direct beneficiaries from 2nd Round national child projects; (d) Table 6: Overview of increase in RE Capacity from 2nd Round national child projects; (e) Annex A – List of Child Projects under the Program; and (d) the compiled UNDP checklist included in the Document's tab.
2. Unofficial English translations for the Niger and Chad LOEs have been included in the LOE PDF compilation.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/04/21, FB:

The PFD is being recommended for technical clearance.

04/19/2021 - FB

This PFD is technically cleared from GPU and moved to PPO review. Only two issues need to be addressed:

1. Remaining issue on classification of cofinancing from GIZ in Benin (see comment above)
2. Still waiting for the LOE for the self-funded child project in Mauritania (no GEF resources).

04/12/2021 - FB

Not yet, please address the comments above and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/12/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

A checklist responding to the requirements set by GEF Council at its 59th meeting, to address the finding of UNDP OAI report was included for each of the child projects.