



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9116		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Promoting Access to Renewable Energy and Development of IT Tools for Rural Communities of Cameroon		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,726,484
Co-financing:	\$41,034,000	Total Project Cost:	\$42,860,484
PIF Approval:	May 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Mahamat Assouyoufi

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MY 4/21/2015: Yes, it is aligned with GEF CCM-1, Programs 1 and 2.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 4/21/2015: Not fully addressed. To the UNFCCC, the country submitted its first national communications in 2005, and a set of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) in 2010. However, the project document does not address	AfDB 08/05/2015 Added into section 11 on the PIF.

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the consistency of the project with the national priorities that are articulated in those submitted documents.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015:</p> <p>Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>MY 4/21/2015:</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>The objective of this project, which is not shown in Table B yet, is to promote solar PV technologies for multipurpose community tele-centers (TCPs) in Cameroon. Below the title of Part II Project Justification, please address drivers of global environmental degradation by answering the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why solar PV technologies have not been widely used in the public sector, such as in multipurpose community tele-centers? 2. What are barriers to the investment in solar PV technologies in the country, from perspectives of the government and the private sector? 3. How will this proposed project address these issues and remove these barriers? <p>Again, in Part II Project Justification, please address the issues of</p>	<p>AfDB 08/05/2015</p> <p>Objective added to Table B</p> <p>Answers for Comments 1,2 & 3 added to the PIF document in Section A1.a in a new section called "Barriers."</p> <p>Answers to remaining comments added to new section A1.F "Innovation, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling up." The comment corresponding to the market transformation comment was also added to this section.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation.</p> <p>For sustainability, please write one short paragraph on how the multipurpose community tele-centers will continue their operations after the GEF project is closed? Where will the operation budget come from for the centers?</p> <p>For market transformation, please write one paragraph on how this project will facilitate investments in solar PV technologies, and change the share of solar PV power generation in the energy mix of Cameroon.</p> <p>For scaling-up, please address all issues (not only the capital issue) that may affect the scaling up of the investment and the use of solar PV technologies in the country. For example, when the number of TCPs is scaled up from 221 to 500, will the country have enough technical professionals to run these TCPs?</p> <p>For Innovation, please write one paragraph to justify why this project is innovative in the country.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MY 4/21/2015: Not at this time.</p> <p>On page 10, the PIF reads: "The</p>	<p>AfDB 08/05/2015 Details of Nbr KW generated added to Section A1.d However, the full cost reasoning and</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposed project requests additional GEF funds to further promote adoption of solar energy for use in telecommunications and ICT infrastructure in rural areas in Cameroun."</p> <p>Please estimate how many kilowatt (kW) of solar PV and other low carbon technologies will be invested with the GEF \$2 million grant. From the data on page 11, the capital cost of the solar PV is more than \$4.5 per watt (assuming that all GEF grant will be used to install solar PV panels and the co-financing will be used for other construction works of the tele-centers). It seems that this number (\$4.5/W) is high with the current available solar PV technologies. Please justify it.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>accurate figures will be provided as a result studies completed in Component 2.</p> <p>Please note that the GEF grant requested for this project (excluding PPG) is \$1.72million. This amount includes Solar PV for about \$1.1million and remaining amount for TA (policy reform, institutional support and additional studies for scaling up or RE in ICT in Cameroon).</p>
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MY 4/21/2015: Not at this time. On page 3, in project outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, please indicate targeted numbers. For example, how many renewable energy systems and how much ICT equipment will be installed under project output 3.1? For each of the tele-centers, please indicate the</p>	<p>AfDB 08/05/2015 Added to Table B, Component 3. For the total capacity and kW, as mentioned under Question 4, this will be defined as a result of the studies completed in Component 2. Also added to page 10 under the brief description of project components.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>capacity of solar PV in kW that will be installed through this project. Please also present the total amount of solar PV capacity to be installed in the project.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MY 4/21/2015: Not at this time.</p> <p>Please indicate if this project is indigenous people relevant. Please also articulate which NGOs and private operators (as briefly shown on page 12) will be involved in the project.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>AfDB 08/05/2015 No. This project is not relevant to indigenous people. As far as we know, Additional NGOs to be consulted added on page 12.</p>
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>MY 4/21/2015: Yes. As of 4/21/2015, Cameroon had not used its GEF-6 STAR allocation (\$16.6 million) yet.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>MY 4/21/2015: Yes. As of 4/21/2015, Cameroon had not used its GEF-6 STAR allocation in climate change focal area (\$2.68 million) yet.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>MY 4/21/2015: N/A</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MY 4/21/2015: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MY 4/21/2015: N/A	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>MY 4/21/2015: No.</p> <p>Please address comments in Boxes: 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p>Other issues to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project objective is not shown in Table B, please fill it; On page 13, the PIF stated the following: "The project is considered to be a cost effective intervention for GEF due to the CO2 emission reduction potential from enhanced use of renewable energy." Then, the PIF shows that the project will use \$2,000,000 GEF grant to mitigate a total of 740 tonnes of CO2 over a period of four years. This is equivalent to GEF\$2,702 per tonne of CO2 mitigation, which is not really cost effective. The reason is that the AfDB did not use an appropriate methodology in GHG accounting for the project. The following approaches are suggested for the calculation: (1) the time period of GHG accounting should be the technical lifetime of the solar PV equipment (e.g. 20 years), not the project implementation period 	<p>AfDB May 8, 2015</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objective is filled in. Elaborated on A1.e, paragraph 4. It is estimated 25 years period for the Solar PV equipment implementation period. Given the capacity production of 730,000kWh annually and the Cameroon grid emission factor of 0.25TCO2/Mwh, the total emission avoided by this project is around 4,562TCO2. PIF has been edited and language improved. Revised Added to Section 1 as well as section A1.b "the Baseline Scenario. The centers were originally meant to also produce adaptation benefits because the type of information provided could help build resilience. However, we were not able to secure SCCF funding. Cameroon does not have the existing capacity for early warning systems and other extreme weather monitoring, or else we would have elaborated on this in the PIF. Social benefits are mentioned in the relevant section of the PIF. <p>AfDB response May 28, 2015 We thanks GEFSEC for this comment. GHG emission reduction figures have</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(4 years); (2) indirect (consequential) emission reductions of the project should be accounted as well. Please contact the GEF Secretariat for consultation if the AfDB is not clear about the approaches.</p> <p>3. English needs improving; 4. Font on pages 15 and 16 needs to be revised. 5. The PIF needs to present more information on Cameroon's energy and GHG emission situation, not so much on tele communications. 6. Can the information technology centers be used to generate more global environment benefits (GEBs)? For example, nowadays information technologies have been widely used to monitor and optimize energy/power supply and consumption, urban transport, power transmission and distribution, and weather forecasting for climate adaptation. If this project can generate any of these GEBs, please present them to better justify this project.</p> <p>MY 5/19/2015: Not completed at this time. The comments were addressed, but the Agency did not revise the PIF. On page 13, the total targeted GHG emission reduction is still 121.5 tonnes of CO₂, the same as in the</p>	<p>been revised including indirect emission reduction. The table presented in page 12 gives details of tCO₂ avoided calculation.</p> <p>Also, PIF has been revised and English improved.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>previous PIF.</p> <p>Please double check each paragraph and page to make sure all the relevant paragraphs and sentences in the PIF have been revised to address the relevant comments.</p> <p>Please estimate consequential (indirect) GHG emission reductions as well. To do so, the Agency needs to count the number of centers that the government of Cameroon has scheduled to finance in the second phase in 2018, and calculate the amount of GHG emission reductions from these centers. If the Agency has difficulty to do the work, please contact the GEF SEC.</p> <p>The English language in the PIF has been improved, but the language still needs further improving. Please have an English professional to edit the document. Please spell out all abbreviations.</p> <p>MY 5/28/2015 All comments were cleared.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 21, 2015	May 08, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 19, 2015	May 28, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 28, 2015	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	MY 5/4/2016 Not really changed. The project title, components, and outputs are the same, but the co-financing loan increased from \$29 million to \$41 million loan of the AfDB, which is fine.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MY 5/4/2016 Yes. Most of the GEF grant will be used in Component 3 for demonstration of low GHG technologies in rural communities.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MY 5/4/2016 Yes. It is stated on page 8.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	MY 5/4/2016 Not completed at this time. In Section A5, please address the risk of climate change on this project. MY 5/9/2016 Yes, comments were addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MY 5/4/2016 Not completed at this time. Please revise Table C on page 3 and make the co-financing data consistent	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>with the numbers in Table 1 on page iii of MEMORANDUM TO: THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS dated June 26, 2015.</p> <p>Please provide co-financing letters from the AfDB for the \$41.034 and from the Grant GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON for \$8.17 million co-financing.</p> <p>MY 5/9/2016 Yes, comments were addressed.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>MY 5/4/2016 Not completed at this time. Please check the numbers in the tracking tool carefully. At least one number is wrong.</p> <p>MY 5/9/2016 Yes, the Tracking Tool has been revised.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	<p>MY 5/4/2016 Not applicable (N/A)</p>	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>MY 5/4/2016 Yes. It is stated on pages 13 and 14.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>MY 5/4/2016 Yes, it is stated on pages 16 and 17.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge	<p>MY 5/4/2016 Yes, it is stated on pages 15.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	MY 5/4/2016 Yes.	
	• STAP	MY 5/4/2016 N/A. It is an MSP.	
	• GEF Council	MY 5/4/2016 N/A.	
	• Convention Secretariat	MY 5/4/2016 N/A.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MY 5/4/2016 Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes: 4, 5 and 6. MY 5/9/2016 Yes, all comments were addressed. The PM recommends CEO Approval.	
Review Date	Review	May 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.