



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

GEF ID:	<b>5149</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Cuba</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Clean Energy Technologies for the Rural Areas in Cuba (CleanEnerg-Cuba)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1; CCM-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,737,524</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$12,461,516</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$15,199,040</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>April 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>David Elrie Rodgers</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Raul Alfaro-Pelico</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. Director Fernandez, MIST, signed the endorsement letter on December 23, 2011, in the amount of \$3.2M inclusive of PPG and agency fee.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER, September 19, 2012. No non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The amount requested for this project, \$3.2M inclusive of PPG and fees would consume the remainder of Cuba's climate change allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	DER, September 19, 2012. NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. This project is CCM-1, technology transfer.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. Table A is properly filled out for CCM-1.	
	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?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The project topics are included in the TNA assessment of the forthcoming national communications.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The technology transfer activities will foster local capacity and should lead to sustained market penetration.	
	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?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The baseline project details Cuba's priority for integrated food and energy productions, both biogas and biofuels. There is very significant multi-lateral investment already occurring. The project description identifies barriers that still remain to be addressed,	

Project Design			
	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?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The project describes key activities that will address the policy and technical barriers.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The project includes the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information and policy development</li> <li>2. Technology transfer and development</li> <li>3. Institution building, training, and promotion.</li> </ol> <p>For component 2, which is shown in the PIF at INV, we need to see more clear description of the investment nature of the GEF funding. If indeed, the GEF funding is technical assistance, then it would be appropriate to delineate component 2 into separate rows for the TA portion and the INV portion. Please clarify this at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The installation of biogas and biofuels technologies are estimated to produce direct emissions reductions of 50-100 kton CO<sub>2</sub>e annually, with additional indirect emissions contributing up to 1 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e over 10 years.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please provide clear description of the technologies</p>	

		penetration, and the amount of energy displaced, and a more developed estimate of GHG benefits.	
	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?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	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)	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The requested amount, \$136,147, is 5% of the total GEF amount.	

Project Financing

	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes.	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	DER, September 19, 2012. Yes. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER, September 19, 2012. a) At CEO endorsement, we would like to see clear description of the types of technologies that will be addressed, and the potential to encourage South/South technology transfer. b) For component 2, which is shown in the PIF at INV, we need to see more clear description of the investment	

		the GEF funding is technical assistance, then it would be appropriate to delineate component 2 into separate rows for the TA portion and the INV portion. Please clarify this at CEO endorsement. c) Please provide clear description of the technologies employed, the scale of market penetration, and the amount of energy displaced, and a more developed estimate of GHG benefits.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.