



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

GEF ID:	4785		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Promoting Investments in the Fight against Climate Change and Ecosystems Protection through Integrated Renewable Energy and Biomass Solutions for Productive Uses and Industrial Applications		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3; CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$10,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,000,000
PIF Approval:	April 13, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Rana Singh, Industrial

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes, Cameroon ratified the climate convention on Oct 19 1994	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes but in part only. Several key aspects of the project that rely on financial instruments (to provide incentives for renewable energy production, and fund grid connections) seem not to correspond to UNIDO's comparative advantage. Please consider liaising with appropriate partners on these issues.	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: To assess this, please clarify how the project intends to use the investment part of its budget. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes but in part only. Please see Q3 for financial aspects. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes. Climate change STAR allocation has not been used yet: \$2,970,000. GEF resources request : \$2,500,000 (PPG included). Other planned requests for climate change amount to \$470,000. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Yes. Climate change STAR allocation has not been used yet: \$2,970,000. GEF resources request: \$2,300,000 (PPG included). Other planned requests for climate change amount to \$198,000.	
	• the focal area allocation?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: see above	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
	• focal area set-aside?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Mostly. For Outcome 3.1. please use the exact wording of the GEF's Focal Area Results Framework. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes, CCM3.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes. It should be noted that though Cameroon has prepared a NPF, this document is not referred in the PIF. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: In part only. The sustainability of the project will depend on (i) proper enforcement of envisioned policies; (ii) sustainability of renewable financing or incentives; and (iii) availability of private sector local capacities in terms of renewable energy production and distribution design, operation, implementation and maintenance. Please address concerns on the sustainability of these key elements. Please see Q14 for suggestions. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Please clear Q14. FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: The problem addressed is clearly described but the baseline needs to be detailed: a) Please clarify more precisely what the World Bank supported Rural Energy	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Fund (REF) is set to do on renewable energy (without the proposed project) and how the proposed project will enable to address the issue differently;</p> <p>b) For a proper assessment, please clarify the assumptions taken regarding which energy sources the investments contemplated in components 2 and 3 will replace;</p> <p>c) For a proper assessment, please present the existing local capacities available in terms of renewable energy production design, implementation and maintenance in the private sector;</p> <p>d) Please describe existing NGO activities relevant to the project (such as those of ADEID).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: The comment c) above is not yet fully addressed. Please see Q14 d) and strengthen the projects activities aimed at ensuring the sustainability of the needed technical capacity development in terms of renewable energy production design, implementation and maintenance in the private sector.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yet to be clarified. Please see Q11 and address the following: a) Please inform of available elements regarding comparative costs and incentives for private sector investment in either renewable or non-renewable energy (especially in rural areas) b) Please specify the two or three demonstration projects envisioned for component 3; c) Please explain how the project would be incremental to existing NGO activities relevant to the project (such as those of ADEID).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Comparative costs between renewable or non-renewable energy production for investments of the private sector in rural areas will have to be provided at CEO-endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Please address the following items: a) Output 1.1 should more clearly aim at the enforcement of the policy and regulatory framework rather than just limit itself to having texts ready for adoption. b) The outputs of component 2 do not seem to relate to any investment (although it component 2 expenses are presented as Investment type). Please modify adequately and separate clearly (different rows) technical assistance financing and investment. c) The relevance of component 1 does</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>not appear clearly in the project. It seems that investment in renewable energy could materialize provided there is an incentive scheme in place and a fund to pay for local small-grid connection (both being dealt with in components 2 and 3 as we understand it). Please clarify.</p> <p>d) Please clarify if the project would focus only on rural areas or not.</p> <p>e) For component 2, the consistency between (i) the outcomes and outputs of table B and (ii) the project description in B.2 is not clear. The link with the REF activities seems interesting but is rather confusing. Please clarify.</p> <p>To address some of these concerns along with concerns of Q10 and provide a more consistent framework and more sustainable project, an option would be to strengthen the link between components 2 and 3 by setting up a sustainable process for rural small-grid renewable energy development. One option to consider is working with the different ministries steering the REF in order to have them design a framework supporting to support rural renewable energy on the long run with: (i) identified fiscal or regulatory incentives, (ii) a specific window in the REF for grants co-financing private sector investments in rural renewable energy development and (iii) technical assistance to help the private sector put in place sustainable business models for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>rural renewable energy. This framework would be first and serve the development of the proposed demonstration activities of component 4 (for which it is strongly suggested to have a higher target of 3-4 MW minimum).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012:</p> <p>a) The comment a) above is not addressed; Output 1.1 has not been modified.</p> <p>b) The component e) above is partially addressed. Please mention clearly in the outputs of component 1 and 2 table B (and in the associated listed activity on top of page 10) the objective of setting up a special RE funding window in the existing Cameroon Rural Electrification Fund (CREF).</p> <p>c) Please confirm that the main policy/regulatory policy envisioned in component I concerns the setting up of the special RE funding window in the CREF. Please then justify the additional use of component 1 compared to what is already defined in component 2.</p> <p>d) Please strengthen the envisioned technical assistance to help the private sector put in place sustainable business models for rural renewable energy by considering the design and implementation of sustainable means for this technical assistance. Please especially consider the targeted size of the CREF funding window (50% for RE as indicated in page 9).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Please address comment c) above concerning the relevance of component 1 in addition to component 2. Please consider simplifying the project framework to component 2 and 3 since component 1 appears now mostly redundant with component 2.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 12, 2012: Cleared. The activities of component 1 and 2 will have to be described detailed at CEO endorsement stage with specific attention devoted to their complementarity.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: The methodology is not presented. Please do so for proper assessment</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: a) Please provide the rationale that lead to the CO2 emission reduction estimates. b) Please explain how the estimation of the GEF funding impact on CO2 emission reduction does not take into account the objective of the REF to fund 20% or renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: a) Please provide the conversion coefficient used (and its source) to convert 3 MW into 150,000 tCO2eq. b) Please justify why having the CREF do 50% RE instead of 20% leads to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>9MW of RE. Based on the proposed project \$6 million of public funding on investments (not counting private co-financing) would lead to 3 MW of RE, hence the additional \$12 from the CREF (30% of \$40 million) may lead to an additional 6 MW, not 9MW.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 12, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes. Socio-economic benefits are presented (provided Q13 is settled) and would support global environment benefits. However, the gender dimension of the project is not addressed yet. Please do so.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes, but in very general terms. Please clarify how their priorities and opinions will be taken into consideration and addressed.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Yes but sustainability issues remain to be clarified. Please see Q10 and Q14.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Please clear Q14.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Not sufficiently. Please address more clearly the sharing of roles and mode of coordination that will be set up with the REF, the private sector, and other funding institutions (the World Bank if appropriate) for components 2 and 3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please also address more clearly the coordination with existing NGO activities relevant to the project (such as those of ADEID).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Not sufficiently. An important part of the project outcomes relies on funding sources that are not yet in the project (for the REF and incentive scheme). The project does not appear to be sustainable without these. Please consider involving adequate partners in the project preparation and implementation.</p> <p>The time frame of the project implementation is confusing since it would seem that the 2 to 3 demonstration projects will not be able to start unless the incentive scheme and policy framework is in place. The latter may take time and therefore render the former almost impossible in the timeframe envisioned. Please clarify. Please see also Q14.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Please confirm that the government co-financing identified will go through the RE special window of the CREF in order to serve as demonstration of the effectiveness of the designed window with the first 3 pilot sites identified.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: GEF project management funding is over the 5% threshold of the GEF amount, net of the GEF project management funding. Please adjust to 5% or below.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Please address Q20 and previous questions for proper assessment. Please detail co-financing arrangements envisioned and respective responsibilities of co-financing partners.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Please clear Q20.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Please see first part of Q20.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Please clear Q20.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>FJ Dec 20 - 2011: The co-financing of the Agency is very small. Please increase the co-financing in line with the importance of the Agency in the project. In addition, most co-financing seems to come from stakeholders not yet identified as partners. Please see also</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Q20.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
	• Council comments?		FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: n.a.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	FJ Dec 20 - 2011: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments. FJ - Apr 6, 2012: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments. FJ - Apr 11, 2012: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments for Q14 and Q15. FJ - Apr 12, 2012: Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	FJ - Apr 12, 2012: See Q13 and Q14.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 20, 2011	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012	
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>FJ/DZ Dec 20 - 2011: The baseline assessment should be completed at the PIF stage. Also, the barriers to renewables should be identified at the PIF stage. Instead, during project preparation please focus on the design and budgeting of project activities. Moreover, the duration of the project preparation is too long, considering the number of person weeks identified.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: No. Please address the previous comments.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: No. The PPG has only slightly been modified (first page) and does not yet take into account comments made in Dec 2011. Please address the above comments by (i) removing activities related to baseline assessments or renewable barriers identification (should have been identified at the PIF stage), (ii) focus more on activities for the design and budgeting of project activities, (iii) make sure these modifications appear in the initial description, in the table of activities and in the Annex A.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>FJ/DZ Dec 20 - 2011: Please revise to reflect the project preparation focus as per the above comment.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 6, 2012: No. Please address the previous comments.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 11, 2012: No. Please revise to reflect the project preparation focus as per the above comment.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	FJ/DZ Dec 20 - 2011: No. Please revise according to the above comments.

		FJ - Apr 6, 2012: No. Please address the previous comments.
		FJ - Apr 11, 2012: No. Please revise according to the above comments.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 20, 2011
	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.