



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

GEF ID:	9067		
Country/Region:	Cook Islands		
Project Title:	Renewable Energy Sector Project		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$4,264,654
Co-financing:	\$25,590,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,991,640
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Woo Yul Lee

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	<p>MY 3/16/2015:</p> <p>Yes. The project is aligned with the GEF6 CCM-1 Program 1 Strategy. But the agency did not put the strategy in Table A.</p> <p>Please complete Table A.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>3/26/2015:</p> <p>This project is aligned with: Program 1 of GEF 6 Strategic Objective CCM-1: Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of low-carbon technologies and mitigation options. Table A has been completed.</p>

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
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>MY 3/16/2015: Yes.</p> <p>This project is consistent with the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for supporting implementation of 100% renewable electricity by 2020. It is also aligned with the country's Second National Communication (2012) under the UNFCCC.</p>	Confirmed
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MY 3/16/2015: Not completed at this time.</p> <p>1. Please address why Cook Islands currently uses diesel or fossil fuel as primary energy for 99% of its power generation, although the country is rich in renewable energy resources. What are the causes or drivers for importing and using fossil energy rather than using renewable energy?</p> <p>2. Please include short descriptions of each of the following topics: innovation, sustainability, and scaling-up.</p> <p>In innovation, please compare this</p>	<p>3/26/2015: Like many other small island nations in the Pacific, the power generation from renewable energy resources has recently become a feasible solution because the up-front capital costs were high and there were high perceived and real technical risks. Addressed under section 1, 1), Part II, on page 5.</p> <p>Technically, the power outputs from the three phase 1 subprojects will be synchronized and integrated into the existing electricity grid using lithium-ion battery storage to make up for the intermittent nature of solar energy and ensure electricity supply even during the night. This will help make the electricity system sustainable, stable, and reliable,</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project with other similar projects that have been implemented, and justify this project is innovative. Other similar projects may include those supported by New Zealand in 2012 and 2014 as indicated in the PIF.</p> <p>In sustainability, please describe how the six solar PV power plants will operate sustainably after the GEF project implementation is over. Will the electricity lifecycle production costs of the solar PV plants be competitive with those of fossil fuel-fired power plants?</p> <p>In scaling up, please provide a road map for Cooks Islands to scale-up its solar PV generation capacity, and present a share of solar PV energy contribution to the energy mix of the country by 2020.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>allowing it to supply clean electricity and meet more than 90% of electricity load demand. Moreover, the additional grant from GEF will allow the government and the local grid-operator to find the most suitable storage technologies for the large renewable energy penetration without negatively affecting the grid. The suggested point has been addressed on page 7.</p> <p>The consultants to be engaged under this component will be the project owner's engineer (POE) team, who will also provide project management support for the responsible government agencies to help implement phase 1 and phase 2 subprojects in the southern islands. The turnkey contractor(s) of both phase 1 and 2 subprojects will provide specialized O&M knowledge transfer to ensure sustainable operation. The suggested point has been addressed on page 7</p> <p>At this stage, there is no tailor-made road map for solar PV generation capacity but the proposed project with the GEF grant will allow the government to assess the potential. This point has been addressed on pages 7-8.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MY 3/16/2015: Yes. It is presented on pages 5 and 6.	3/26/2015: Confirmed
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to	MY 3/16/2015: Not at this time.	3/26/2015:

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>In Table B, there are two INV components. Could they be put together as one component? Alternatively, they might be presented in one component with two sub-components.</p> <p>Also, on page 6, under "Section 3) the proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project", please briefly describe expected outcomes and components of the project.</p> <p>The total budget of the project is higher than the total STAR allocation of the country. Please revise the budget accordingly. See also comments in Box 7.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>The two investment components have been combined in one component. We think the current presentation in Table B more clearly shows the scope breakdown of co-financing and the GEF grant. Please also note that an outcome has been added under Component 2 on effective monitoring and evaluation. This will be undertaken through the baseline project in order to meet ADB and GEF requirements. Please also refer to the last paragraph on page 6.</p> <p>The expected outcome and components of the project have been included on page 6.</p> <p>Revised accordingly. The breakdown is also provided in an excel sheet.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MY 3/16/2015: Not completed at this time. Please consider engaging Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in this project, if applicable.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>3/26/2015: The project team will consider engaging with a Civil Society Organization, if necessary, in the further project design process. Part II, 2. Stakeholders section has been updated (last paragraph).</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
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 3/16/2015:</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>As of 3/16/2015, as per the GEF PMIS and the GEF Trustee, Cook Islands has a budget of \$4,669,796 in STAR. This country is flexible in using its STAR resources. However, the OFP endorsed \$4,670,000 for this project. Please reduce the total budget of this project to \$4,669,796, and adjust the project component budget in Table B accordingly.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>3/26/2015:</p> <p>The Budget Table has been revised accordingly.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>MY 3/16/2015:</p> <p>As of 3/16/2015, Cook Islands has a budget of \$2 million in climate change focal area. It is a flexible country in using its SATR resources. The total STAR budget of the country (\$4,669,796) can cover this project.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>3/26/2015:</p> <p>Noted - The Budget Table has been revised accordingly</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of 	<p>MY 3/16/2015:</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MY 3/16/2015: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MY 3/16/2015: N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MY 3/16/2015: Not at this time. Please address the comments in Boxes 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7.</p> <p>3/26/2015: Yes. All comments were cleared.</p>	<p>3/26/2015: Above addressed accordingly.</p>
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2015	March 26, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 26, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Not at this time. The project components and budgets have been changed from the PIF to the CEO ER. Please articulate these</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>changes and any other changes of the project, and present them in a table under the caption of Part II Project Justification on page 5.</p> <p>MY 7/11/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and the document was revised.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Yes. Although there are some changes, the project structure remains the same.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Yes.</p>	
	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)	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Yes. The ADB has done the risk analysis (see page 10 of the CEO ER document).</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Yes. It was uploaded onto the PMIS already.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Yes. It was uploaded onto the PMIS already. However, there is a mistake in Table E on page 4 of the CEO ER. The total target of GHG emission reduction (301,430) is the sum of three components including the following</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>two:</p> <p>Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided 167,461 Bottom-Up Approach</p> <p>Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided 22,328 Top-Down Approach</p> <p>Correct calculation should include only one of them above. The PM would suggest to use 167,461 plus the amount of direction emission reductions in the calculation.</p> <p>MY 7/11/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and the number has been changed.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	MY 6/27/2016 N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MY 6/27/2016 Yes, it is stated on page 11.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MY 6/27/2016 Yes, it is stated on pages 12 and 13.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MY 6/27/2016 Yes, it is stated on page 12.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	MY 6/27/2016 N/A	
	• STAP	MY 6/27/2016 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	MY 6/27/2016 Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	MY 6/27/2016 N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>MY 6/27/2016 Not completed at this time. Please address comment in Boxes 1 and 6.</p> <p>MY 7/11/2016 Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared. The PM recommends project CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	June 27, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 11, 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.