



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

|  |   |                              |                |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 5344  |                              |                |
| Country/Region:                            | Cabo Verde  |                              |                |
| Project Title:                             | Cape Verde Appliances & Building Energy-Efficiency Project (CABEEP) |                              |                |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 4996 (UNDP)    |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Climate Change |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CCM-2;  |                              |                |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$1,918,400    |
| Co-financing:                              | \$10,036,998  | Total Project Cost:          | \$11,955,398   |
| PIF Approval:                              | August 23, 2013   | Council Approval/Expected:   |                |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                |
| Program Manager:                           | David Elrie Rodgers   | Agency Contact Person:       | John O'Brien   |

| Review Criteria       | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Eligibility           | 1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?   | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |
|                       | 2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?   | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply): |  |  |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?  | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?  | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.<br>1) The amount available in CCM is \$1,850,000. The letter of endorsement requests \$2.2M from CCM (including agency fees). Since Cape Verde is a flexible country, the resources will be | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

| Review Criteria     | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                     |   | programmed from other focal areas.<br>2) The project amount is less than \$2M. Therefore this project will be classified as a medium sized project.<br><br>DER, April 30, 2013.<br>1) Focal areas are fine. Comment cleared<br>2) The project has been resubmitted as an MSP. Comment cleared  |  |
|                     | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access  | DER, April 2, 2013. NA   | NA   |
|                     | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?   | DER, April 2, 2013. NA   | NA   |
|                     | • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund   | DER, April 2, 2013. NA   | NA   |
|                     | • focal area set-aside?   | DER, April 2, 2013. NA   | NA   |
| Strategic Alignment | 4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ?<br><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i> | DER, April 2, 2013. The correct focal area objectives are identified. However, in Table A, project management should be folded into the focal area objectives, not listed separately. In Table B, project management is properly listed separately and need not be changed. Please correct for the re-submission.<br><br>DER, April 30, 2013. Table A has been corrected. comment cleared. | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |
|                     | 5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?   | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |
|                     | 6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to  | DER, April 2, 2013. In general, the baseline project spends significant time on renewable energy baseline activities.  | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Project Design  | address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?   | <p>Please strengthen the discussion of the baseline project as it relates to the proposed GEF project on energy efficiency.</p> <p>DER, April 30, 2013. The baseline description has been strengthened. Comment cleared.</p>   |  |
|                 | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | <p>DER, April 2, 2013. Please address the following comments:<br/>The project components include:<br/>1. Enabling Policy, Institutional, and Legislative Framework for Energy-Efficiency in Buildings<br/>2. Energy-Efficiency improvements through Standards &amp; Labeling for appliances<br/>3. Energy efficiency solutions in a selection of public buildings through selected pilot demonstration projects<br/>4. Replication &amp; Dissemination</p> <p>1) Table 1 on page 7 refers to renewable energy, but the contents refer to efficiency. Please clarify.<br/>2) Component 1 should include building code requirements that promote climate resiliency and adaptation. These stronger codes can be implemented in simultaneously with energy efficiency codes at lower overall cost to the government and with reduced duplication of effort. This issue is briefly identified in Table 2 on page 13, but needs expanded emphasis. Please clarify.<br/>3) Please address water usage in the inventory of Component 1.</p> | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.                                |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
|                 |   | <p>4) Component 2. The approach of coordinating with ECOWAS is highly valid. Please also consider during the project design phase if the appliances considered for regulation may include water using appliances and if so, please include water efficiency performance in the regulatory design. (Refer to GEF/UNDP project #5316 Seychelles for similar concepts.)</p> <p>5) Component 3. Please apply water saving and climate resiliency building codes identified in component 1 to the pilot projects. Please include water performance in 3.2 and 3.3</p> <p>6) Component 4. Please apply water saving and climate resiliency building codes in the case studies and training documents.</p> <p>DER, April 30, 2013.</p> <p>1) Fixed. Comment cleared.</p> <p>2) Clarifying language added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>3) Water use and relation to efficiency addressed. Comment cleared.</p> <p>4) Water use efficiency included in component 2. Comment cleared.</p> <p>5) Comment cleared.</p> <p>6) Comment cleared.</p> |   |
|                 | 8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes. The PIF estimates a GHG emissions reduction of 108,000 t CO <sub>2</sub> e over 20 year lifetime resulting from energy savings of 150,000 MWhr. At CEO endorsement, please refine this estimate using the STAP methodology for energy efficiency investments and include other potential   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes. Emissions reductions are estimated to be 704 kt CO <sub>2</sub> e over the 10 year lifetime resulting from energy savings of 115,818 MWhr annually. |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
|                 |   | global environmental benefits, such as water and adaptation benefits.  |   |
|                 | 9. Is there a clear description of:<br>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and<br>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? |  | DER, April 30, 2012. This will be reviewed after PPG.<br>DER, October 28, 2014. Yes. Socio-economic benefits are covered. |
|                 | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?   | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes. Stakeholder consultation is well documented.  |
|                 | 11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)   | DER, April 2, 2013. Not sufficiently. Even though Table 2 mentions resiliency, please include more explanation on the issues of climate resiliency and the potential to achieve substantial levels of climate change adaptation through energy efficient building design. Please refer to GEF/UNDP project #5316 in Seychelles for examples of how to incorporate resiliency and water saving approaches in combined regulatory approaches at overall lower cost.<br><br>DER, April 30, 2013. Clarifying language has been added. Comment cleared. | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.   |
|                 | 12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?   | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes. Well coordinated with regional efforts, including ECOWAS.                                     |

| Review Criteria   | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
|                   | <p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul> | DER, April 2, 2013. This project will help Cape Verde, a nation of small islands, simultaneously address rising energy demand and reduce GHG emissions through application of energy efficiency in building codes and appliances. The project will also incorporate climate resiliency in the regulatory frameworks. | DER, October 28, 2014. The project implements regional guidelines, as well as the UNEP/GEF enlighten global best practices in the project design.  |
|                   | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?   |  | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.  |
|                   | 15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?   |  | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.  |
| Project Financing | 16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?  | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.  |
|                   | 17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?  | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. The total amount of co-financing is adequate. However, Table C includes a row labeled "private sector" with amount TBD. We cannot accept a row with TBD. The row can include estimates, |

| Review Criteria                          | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup> | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?  |  | based on sound and documented methodology, for future private sector co-financing that can be confirmed by the agency at the time of CEO endorsement. For example, if private sector partners will be chosen for participation in the project by demonstrating an equity investment of co-financing, this can be estimated and reported by the Agency even if a co-financing letter is not available.<br><br>DER, December 15, 2014. The line with TBD was removed; existing private sector co-financing is confirmed. Comment cleared. |
|  | 18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?  | DER, April 2, 2013. Yes.   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.   |
|  | 19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?<br><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | DER, April 30, 2013. PPG requested within norms.                     | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.   |
|  | 20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?   | DER, April 2, 2013. NA   | DER, October 28, 2014. NA   |
| <b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b> | 21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?   |  | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.   |

| Review Criteria                             | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)  |
|---|--|---|---|
|   | 22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? |   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes.   |
| Agency Responses                            | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:  |   |   |
|   | • STAP?  |   | DER, October 28, 2014. Yes, the request to use the STAP methodology was adopted. Comment cleared.                 |
|   | • Convention Secretariat?  |   | NA  |
|   | • The Council?   |   | NA  |
|   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |   | NA  |
| Secretariat Recommendation                  |  |   |   |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | <b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | DER, April 2, 2013. Not yet. Please address the comments in boxes 2,3,4,6, 7,11.<br><br>DER, April 30, 2013. Yes. All comments cleared.   |   |
|   | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.   | DER, April 2, 2013. At CEO endorsement, please refine the GHG estimate using the STAP methodology for energy efficiency investments and include other potential global environmental benefits, such as water and adaptation benefits. |   |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | <b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>  |   | DER, October 28, 2014. Not at this time. Please address the comment in box 17.<br><br>December 15, 2014, cleared. |
|   | First review*  | April 02, 2013  | October 28, 2014  |
| Review Date (s)                             | Additional review (as necessary)   | April 30, 2013  | December 15, 2014   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |



**\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**