



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

GEF ID:	4923		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Promotion of mini & micro-hydro power plants in Congo DR		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4690 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,187,669
Co-financing:	\$13,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,687,669
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Benoit Lebot

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 - Apr 19, 2012: Yes, the Democratic Republic of Congo ratified the UNFCCC Convention on March 23, 2005	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes, by a letter dated July 14, 2011. FJ - May 2, 2013: The letter of endorsement provided refers to the previous conception of the project where improved cook stoves were included. Please provide an updated endorsement letter ensuring that the country's government endorses the changes operated in the new version	

*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)
		<p>submitted.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: OFP endorsement letters should be complete with indications of the amounts for project grant, PPG, Agency fee clearly spelled out. Please provide an endorsement letter with such information.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 22, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: This is a grant	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes, the Congo DR remaining CCM allocation is \$8.92 million and this project requests \$3.595 million	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		

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 - Apr 19, 2012: Yes	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No.</p> <p>a) Improvements of cook stoves concern energy efficiency and should therefore refer to objective CCM-2.</p> <p>b) Please review the expected outcomes since they should have the same terms as appearing in the Reference Guide.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please address the project consistency with Congo DR 2nd national communication. Please address especially the relevance of the project with regard to the government's pilot project of 50 mini/macro hydro power plants listed in this communication.</p> <p>b) Please mention the project's consistency with Congo DR National Port Folio Document.</p> <p>c) Please address the project consistency with Congo DR Technology Needs Assessment report.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No, Please address the following:</p> <p>a) Please explain how the project will overcome the lack of technical capacity on mini/micro hydro and improved cook stoves identified the PIF.</p> <p>b) Please also explain how this might be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>done in a sustainable way for designing, building, operating and maintaining the investments/devices.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Please address Q14</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No, Please address the following:</p> <p>a) Chapter A2 seems to link the micro-hydro development with a potential decrease on fuel wood. This might be true for improved cook stoves, but micro-hydro power plants are more likely to respond to power supply development needs. In this situation, please present in the baseline, what are the current energy uses in the targeted regions and what are the current energy sources and their likely evolution, especially detailing the energy uses that the project will modify. Please also explain how the situation would evolve without GEF intervention regarding electricity production and uses.</p> <p>b) Please explain why past mini-hydro plants have not managed to operate well in the past since this is key in identifying the baseline situation and existing barriers.</p> <p>c) The support provided by the government of Wallonia appears to have the same objectives as Component 1 and seems to be consistent in itself. Please clearly explain the difference of the former compared to the proposed activities and why additional work is needed in this area.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>d) Please explain what the REDD program in DR Congo is doing or set to do, especially in relation with cook stoves. Please also clearly explain the difference of the activities of this program compared to the proposed activities of component 3 and why additional work is needed in this area.</p> <p>e) Please briefly explain why the current legal, regulatory, and political framework does not enable the private sector to implement and exploit small hydroelectric stations.</p> <p>f) Please clarify why the PIF identifies a lack of skills for the identification of sites, conception and studies of micro hydroelectric stations while at the same time acknowledging that 300 micro/mini-hydro sites have already been identified. Please also explain how the PNUD/GEF prefeasibility study on micro/mini-hydro sites (2004) feeds into the project proposal and why a national atlas for potential micro-hydropower generation sites is needed.</p> <p>g) Please address Q9 a)</p> <p>h) Please briefly explain what are the ongoing and planned projects and programs linked to access to sustainable modern energy & sustainable forest management in DR Congo cited in chapter B6.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Please address Q13.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 22, 2013:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared.	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please address Q11 for a proper assessment.</p> <p>b) Please detail, for each component, the difference between the situation with GEF funding in the project and the situation without GEF funding, in terms of activities and potential impacts.</p> <p>c) The last chapter of paragraph B3 states that micro-hydro power plants are often the cheapest power supply solution. Please justify why, then, micro-hydro power plants are not considered as baseline.</p> <p>d) Please describe the different changes in energy use that the project will generate, including, when relevant, increases in energy uses.</p> <p>e) Please also describe GHG producing activities that will be affected by the implementation of the project.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013:</p> <p>A key element regarding the project incremental value remains to be clarified.</p> <p>a) The PIF states that the promoted MHP will replace diesel based</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>electricity production. At the same time the main goal of the DRC government and of several of the selected pilot sites is to increase electricity access. Therefore the project could easily end up developing new means for electricity production (a laudable development goal) without the environmental benefit of having renewable energy replacing diesel based generator (what the GEF could legitimately fund). Please clarify how the project will avoid situations where MHP investments develop new electricity supplies without replacing fossil fuel based energy production. Among others, you may want to present the consumption trends of diesel generator based electricity and compare these with the expected hydro-electricity from the pilots. You may also want to clarify what will happen to the existing diesel generators for instance.</p> <p>b) Please also clarify the main expected uses of the electricity to be produced. If, as presented in the PIF, the renewable electricity produced is mainly devoted to economic development through productive activities, clarifications will be needed on the potential emissions associated with such development and activities. If, as presented in the previous version of the PIF, one of the end-use of this hydro-electricity is wood processing, you would have to demonstrate that the project will not then facilitate unsustainable forest exploitation indirectly and therefore</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>induce CO2 emissions.</p> <p>c) Please clarify why no national clearinghouse mechanism for MHP developers has been put in place yet. What are the barriers that impeded its constitution? What will the project do that could not have been done otherwise?</p> <p>FJ â€™ Aug 13, 2013:</p> <p>a) Thank you for the clarifications. It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify, for the targeted investments, how the expected energy production compares to the existing local unsustainable energy consumption and how the project will avoid situations where MHP investments develop new electricity supplies without replacing fossil fuel based energy production.</p> <p>b) Thank you for the clarifications. It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify, for the targeted investments, the expected productive users of the renewable energy to be produced and will account the potential impact the development of their activity may have on greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>c) Thank you for the clarifications. It is expected that the functioning of the proposed clearinghouse will not be limited to information stored and updated on a website. Please confirm.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 22, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. Please address	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sufficiently clear?	<p>the followings:</p> <p>a) Please justify the relevance and consistency of component 2 (micro-hydro) and 3 (cook stoves). The two components seem completely independent one from the other and component 1 (enabling environment) does not focus on cook stoves. You may consider either to focus more the project on either component or to design a project aiming at changes of all rural energy uses to reduce their GHG impact.</p> <p>b) The sustainability of component 2 (micro-hydro) should be improved. At this stage, (i) the awaited private sector involvement that would be needed to replicate the projects achievements beyond the 3 pilot sites does not appear in the co-financings listed and (ii) the financial mechanisms to encourage such investments are not identified. Please improve the sustainability of the project on these issues.</p> <p>c) A similar remark can be made regarding component 3. One would expect a transformational change aiming at disseminating improved cook stoves in all afro-forest communities, with mechanisms ensuring the sustainability of such endeavor. Please consider modifying the project to improve its sustainability on these issues.</p> <p>d) Please explain how the project will ensure to reduce GHG emissions when at the same time facilitating energy access for wood-processing, enabling</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the development of small businesses, farming and cattle breeding.</p> <p>e) Please precise the number of feasibility studies envisioned in Component 2 and specify how these would complement existing feasibility of pre-feasibility studies of mini/micro-hydro power stations.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Component 1: a) The project description seems to imply that output 1.1 (policy package) is the combination of outputs 1.2 (feed-in tariff) and 1.3 (electricity code, concession regime, PPAs). If that is the case, why have an additional (rather undefined) output such as output 1.1? If it is not the case, what is meant by the policy package of output 1.1? b) Please clarify what is meant by a harmonized national electricity code and why this is a way to address an existing barrier (a barrier that would need to be clearly identified as well). c) Please clarify (i) whether mini-grid tariffs would have to fall under the same tariffs as the national grid, (ii) if mini-grids would have the possibility to have higher tariff level and would therefore need lower (or no) subsidy through feed-in tariffs. d) Please clarify what incentives and de-risking instruments will be considered and why. Please also clarify why de-risking related activities are not first in component 1 as advocated in the recent</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>UNDP publications.</p> <p>e) It is not clear how one of the barriers mentioned by the PIF (i.e. access to capital) will be overcome. Please clarify how finance barriers will be removed by the proposed project so that the private sector in this industry can have access to low cost financing even after closure of the GEF project.</p> <p>f) The project seems to include three redundant instruments to address/cover the issue of potentially high production cost for MHP electricity: the design of (i) efficient tariff for off-grid MHP electricity, (ii) feed-in tariffs, and (iii) an output-based aid scheme to cover the expected price-premium. Any of the three instruments would appear to be sufficient. Please clarify the need for such combination.</p> <p>g) Please clarify how the current size of funding for the output based aid scheme has been defined. Please also clarify how the project will ensure that the associated support may be sustained beyond project implementation.</p> <p>h) The project will help design a feed-in tariff for MHPs. Please clarify (i) what financial/budget means the government will use to sustain this tariff, (ii) which ministers are key to decide on the mobilization of such financial/budget means beyond the ministry of energy, (iii) how these ministers will be involved in the project, and (iv) what commitment the government has to mobilizing such financial/budget means.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 2:</p> <p>i) The necessary training of the different stakeholders will require means, including financial means. Please clarify how the project will ensure that the necessary financial means will continue to exist beyond the project completion for training needs.</p> <p>j) Please clarify who will be trained for O&M&M and where these trained people would be located. It is unlikely that people trained on O&M&M in Kinshasa will be able to provide O&M&M services in North Kivu given the size of the country and the difficulty to travel. The adequacy between who is trained and where their training will be needed is yet to be clarified.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>k) Please clarify that the mechanisms, policies and training of components 1 and 2 will be not only validated by the pilots of component 3 but also that those pilots will make use of component 1 and 2 results (and therefore will come at a later stage, once the previous components have delivered results that component 3 will test and will help to adapt if necessary).</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>l) Please clarify how the project will ensure the means for a sustained activity of the proposed clearinghouse beyond project's completion.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ â€™ Aug 13, 2013:</p> <p>a) and b) Cleared</p> <p>c) It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify whether the considered mini grids can develop viable self-sustaining tariffs and adapt the project activities accordingly.</p> <p>d) Cleared</p> <p>e) Thank you for the clarifications. It is understood that, while access to capital is a key barrier, the proposed project will not address it since other potential partners are preparing to do so. It is then expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify what partner the project will have to address capital access issues and whether these capital sources are sustainable (e.g. beyond the project duration).</p> <p>f) and g) Thank you for the additional elements. The functioning of the proposed output based aid is not clear yet. What output would be uses in this system to trigger funding? Would the aid apply to any kWh produced and consumed? Would it target certain consumers only? How would the aid avoid being a disincentive to improve energy tariffs collection? Would the subsidy be fixed or decreasing over time? Also, It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify how the transition from a GEF funded output based aid to a nationally funded aid (through the FONEL) will be prepared and rendered functional by the project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>before its completion. h) Cleared i) and j) It is understood that the project will develop training curricula and educational materials, while its partners will take care of the actual implementation of the trainings considered necessary. It is then expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify what partner the project will have to implement the trainings and whether their means to implement such trainings are sustainable (e.g. may last beyond the project duration to enable training for replications of MHP and for turn-over staff). k) and l) Cleared</p> <p>FJ - Aug 22, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. a) Please detail the assumptions and sources used for the estimated global environmental benefits presented. b) Please take into account the potential of the project on activities that may be sources of GHG emissions or of forest depletion (such as wood processing, cattle breeding, etc) and provide an assessment of the balanced impact of the project including emission reductions and emission increases when relevant.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Please address Q13 a) and b) and adjust the estimation of GHG emission</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>benefits accordingly.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Aug 13, 2013: 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 - Apr 19, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Yes.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Regarding the stakeholders' table of part A.2: a) Please clarify why the private sector does not seem to be involved in investment activities. b) Please clarify why communities seem to have a role limited facilitating consultations.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Aug 13, 2013: 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 - Apr 19, 2012:No. Please address the following: a) Please explain the mitigation means envisioned for the policy and regulatory risks. b) For the technical risks, please briefly explain how the project will ensure that spare parts will be standard among sites, locally manufactured, readily available for transport and installation at minimal costs. c) For the financial risks: Please clarify</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the means that the project will use to ensure that (i) operation and maintenance costs are covered, (ii) electricity bills can be paid and (iii) improved cook stoves are widely adopted.</p> <p>f) Please address the risk of an unsustainable use of forest resources that might be linked with the project activities.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013:</p> <p>a) One of the means proposed to mitigate natural risks (designing small dams and reservoirs to regularize the flow of water) would entail additional risks. Please consider alternative mitigating measures.</p> <p>b) Please consider and address the risk associated with climate change impact on water flows.</p> <p>c) On the risks associated with conflict, please clarify whether UNDP has the experience of managing clean energy projects in such situations and what means it may then use, based on this experience, to maintain activities in conflict zones.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: 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 - Apr 19, 2012: Please explain the links, complementarity and potential overlap with the REDD program in Congo DR project in terms of activities and funding.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - May 2, 2013: a) Please clarify whether GEF supported MHP projects in in Nigeria and Tanzania may be of use to the proposed project. b) Please avoid including references to a GEF project in Congo-Brazzaville that have not been approved by the GEF council yet as if it had already been.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. Please briefly describe the project's implementation/ execution arrangements.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Details on the project's implementation/ execution arrangements would be expected by CEO endorsement request.</p>	
	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 - Apr 19, 2012: No. Since the GEF financing requested is more than \$2 million, project management costs should be lower than 5 % of GEF requested financing. Please downscale the requested project management costs.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Cleared.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Please justify the financing and co-financing level of component 3 since the current budget level does not seem in line with a transformational change in the country's cook stoves.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: a) Please clarify (i) what the co-financing soft loan of the World Bank will be used for in the project, (ii) to what World Bank it is attached, and (iii) how it will be key to the project's expected achievements. b) The baseline description mentions an \$8 million financial commitment from bilateral donors for MHP but this co-financing does not appear in the co-financing table. Please clarify.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: a) Details are expected by CEO endorsement stage on the World Bank existing or planned involvement in the preparation of investments for decentralized rural electrification and on how the project will avoid any overlap with these activities. b) Cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: The co-financing ratio is 1:2.2, which is very low. a) Please endeavor to identify additional co-financing. You may want to look for private sector co-financing in mini/micro-hydro power plants and for increased co-financing for a</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>transformational development of improved cook stoves.</p> <p>b) Please also improve the UNDP co-financing of the project currently limited to the project management costs level.</p> <p>c) Please complete the co-financing amounts from UNDP in chapter C1.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Please address Q24.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. See Q25 b).</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	FJ - Apr 19, 2012: n.a.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: No. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>FJ - May 2, 2013: No. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: No. Please address the above comments</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Q2, Q13 c) and Q14 f) and g).</p> <p>FJ - Aug 22, 2013: Yes. The project is technically cleared and may be considered for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 19, 2012: Following the letter from GEF CEO to UNDP dated April 9, 2012, specific attention will be devoted to ensure that the project do not include any costs beyond (i) project management costs, (ii) agency fees and (iii) funding for project activities.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 13, 2013: It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will clarify:</p> <p>a) For the targeted investments, how the expected energy production compares to the existing local unsustainable energy consumption and how the project will avoid situations where MHP investments develop new electricity supplies without replacing fossil fuel based energy production.</p> <p>b) For the targeted investments, the expected productive users of the renewable energy to be produced and will account the potential impact the development of their activity may have on greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>c) Whether the considered mini grids can develop viable self-sustaining tariffs and adapt the project activities accordingly.</p> <p>d) What partner the project will have to address capital access issues and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>whether these capital sources are sustainable (e.g. beyond the project duration).</p> <p>e) How the transition from a GEF funded output based aid to a nationally funded aid (through the FONEL) will be prepared and rendered functional by the project before its completion.</p> <p>f) What partner the project will have to implement the trainings and whether their means to implement such trainings are sustainable (e.g. may last beyond the project duration to enable training for replications of MHP and for turn-over staff).</p> <p>g) The World Bank existing or planned involvement in the preparation of investments for decentralized rural electrification and how the project will avoid any overlap with the World Bank activities.</p>	
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*	April 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 02, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 13, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 22, 2013	
	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?	FJ - Apr 2, 2012: No. Please address the above comments: a) No PPG activity appears to be planned to assess operation and maintenance costs and to analyze the means needed to ensure a sustainable coverage of these costs. Please justify. b) No PPG activity appears to be planned to assess the training needs and analyze the means needed to deliver them. Please justify. c) No PPG activity appears to be planned to analyze the means needed for a full scale transformational diffusion of improved cook stoves. Please justify. d) Please explain if the PPG will help prepare private sector involvements in the project.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	FJ - Apr 2, 2012: No. a) Please remove activities 7 and 8 since they refer to agency's activities (compiling results of studies into a CEO endorsement request) that may not be funded by a PPG. b) Please justify the need for international consultants and why the associated tasks may not be performed by local consultants. c) The tasks allocated to the local micro-hydro specialist do not seem strongly related to micro-hydro power. Please justify. Please also justify why, a project aimed at fostering national sustainable capacities for micro-hydro development would not rely more on local experts capacity in the PPG.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	FJ - Apr 2, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. Please note that modifications of the PIF will likely require thorough modifications in the PPG proposal.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 19, 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.