



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

GEF ID:	9103		
Country/Region:	Cambodia		
Project Title:	Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (S-RET)		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-3; CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,600,000
Co-financing:	\$23,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,750,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawlestone Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Roshan Cooke

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>NOT CLEAR. A technology transfer project that supports the demonstration and deployment of mitigation technology, even if financed through SCCF-B, should also be aligned with relevant CCM objectives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include relevant CCM objectives in the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) and adjust the distribution of the SCCF grant and co-financing accordingly.</p> <p>03/31/2015 – YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with

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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<p>national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>Cambodia's overarching development strategies, including the Rectangular Strategy and the National Strategic Development Plan. The project is also consistent with the country's Climate Change Strategic Plan, and Green Growth Plan, as well as its TNA and Technology Action Plan (TAP).</p> <p>To the extent that the proposed project addresses Cambodia's priorities in climate change adaptation, however, those priorities should be clearly referenced in Section II.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: To the extent that the proposed project addresses Cambodia's priorities in climate change adaptation, please reference relevant strategies and plans, including the NAPA, in Section II.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>03/31/2015 " YES. The re-submission provides further information on how the proposed project is aligned with Cambodia's Climate Change Action Plan (CCCAP) and its sectoral plan for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (2014-2018); and it identifies the specific NAPA priorities towards which the project would contribute.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>The project addresses an important driver of forest degradation and unsustainable land management in Cambodia, but issues of sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed in absence of further clarity on the baseline and additional/ incremental reasoning.</p> <p>Moreover, the PIF could further clarify the extent to</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>which the proposed technologies and approaches can be considered innovative – the technologies listed on pp. 5-6 are well understood and are being deployed under the baseline scenario.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4 below, please (i) revisit and strengthen the description of the sustainability strategy and the potential for scaling up, as appropriate; and (ii) clarify the innovative aspects of the proposed project.</p> <p>03/31/2015 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>The re-submission clarifies the innovative aspects of the proposed project, and outlines a viable strategy to ensure sustainability and promote scaling up.</p> <p>The project will introduce and disseminate locally adapted, small-scale renewable energy technologies for smallholder farmers. The technologies have benefited from field trials and have shown clear potential in terms of cost-effectiveness and sustainability, but they are as of yet not widely known or used. By creating a critical mass of smallholders that use RETs for agricultural production and processing, as well as other income-generating activities, with demonstrated economic returns; by supporting the local private sector; and by removing policy barriers; the project aims to make a significant contribution towards the large-scale adoption of RETs by Cambodia's 2 million smallholder households.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	NOT CLEAR: The PIF provides a detailed overview of the baseline situation, and the baseline projects and programs on which the proposed SCCF grant would build. Section II.1 of the PIF should clarify, nevertheless, how the baseline programs relate to the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C.</p> <p>In addition to the baseline programs described, Section II.5 of the PIF should clarify how the proposed project will complement and coordinate with the UNIDO-GEF projects ‘Reduction of GHG Emission through Promotion of Commercial Biogas Plants’ (GEF ID: 5421) and ‘Climate Change Related Technology Transfer for Cambodia: Using Agricultural Residue Biomass for Sustainable Energy Solutions’ (GEF ID: 4024). The projects promote the transfer of many of the technologies proposed in the PIF.</p> <p>While the PADEE project targets 90,000 households, the proposed SCCF grant would directly benefit some 10,000 households. The PIF could clarify how this subset of beneficiary households would be selected with a view to maximizing the benefits of renewable energy technologies for climate change mitigation and/or adaptation.</p> <p>Specifically with respect to Component 1, the number of beneficiary households seems modest relative to the SCCF contribution of \$3.57 million. This would translate into \$357 per household, which is more than twice the subsidy provided under the National Biodigester Programme. The PIF could clarify the proposed approach to promote RET uptake by smallholder households, particularly from the perspective of cost-effectiveness. Moreover, the PIF should clarify how the proposed project would work with the private sector to foster sustainability.</p> <p>With respect to the expected mitigation benefits, the PIF should provide indicative emissions reduction targets in Table F of the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how the baseline programs described in Section II.1 of the PIF relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C; (ii) explain how coordination and coherence will be ensured relevant GEF-financed projects, particularly those promoting the transfer of renewable energy technologies in rural Cambodia; (iii) clarify how households would be targeted under Component 1 with a view to maximizing the benefits for climate change mitigation and/or adaptation; (iv) provide more information on the proposed approach to promoting RET uptake by smallholder households, considering in particular the cost-effectiveness of the proposed approach, private sector engagement and sustainability; and (v) provide indicative emissions reduction targets in Table F of the PIF.</p> <p>03/31/2015 “ YES. The re-submission specifies how the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing relate to the baseline initiatives described in Section II.3 of the PIF; and how it would complement and be coordinated with other relevant GEF-financed projects. The revised PIF also provides more information on the targeting of beneficiary households, the proposed financing arrangements for promoting RET uptake, and it provides an indicative target for direct emissions reductions.</p>
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>03/31/2015 “ YES.</p>
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender</p>	<p>YES. Socio-economic aspects, including gender</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	dimensions and CSO involvement, have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	
	• The focal area allocation?	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	YES. The proposed grant (\$5.20 million, including Agency fee and PPG) is available from the SCCF Program for Technology Transfer (SCCF-B).
	• Focal area set-aside?	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 above. 03/31/2015 " YES.
Review Date	Review	March 25, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	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)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	

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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	