



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

GEF ID:	4790		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Utilizing Solar Energy for Industrial Process Heat in Egyptian Industry		
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; Project Mana; CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$80,000	Project Grant:	\$6,500,000
Co-financing:	\$37,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$43,880,000
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Rana Ghoneim

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?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 8, 2014: Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. No. Please supply endorsement letter. DER, March 26, 2012. Yes. The endorsement letter provides for \$7.31M for the project, PPG, and fee. Signed by OFP Mr. Hegazy on 11 March 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 8, 2014: Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. The project does not yet include a non-grant instrument. UNIDO is encouraged to identify potential partners who can manage non-grant instruments, such as	XT, October 8, 2014: N/A

*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>risk guarantee or revolving loan programs. Please strengthen the role for private sector financial institutions in the project.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. A non-grant instrument and private sector involvement will be explored during the PPG phase. Comment cleared.</p>	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 8, 2014: Yes
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	na
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA
	• focal area set-aside?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not yet.</p> <p>a) For CCM-1, more justification is needed for the innovative, low-carbon technologies. If the solar technologies being proposed are commercially available and already in use in Egypt, CCM-1 is not appropriate. Please clarify.</p> <p>b) Table D is not filled out. Please supply.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012.</p> <p>a) Project has been re-classified as</p>	<p>XT, October 8, 2014</p> <p>The project classifies as CCM-2 and CCM-3.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CCM3, Renewable energy. Comment cleared. b) Table D is not required, but is filled out regardless. Thank you.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 8, 2014: Yes
	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/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 8, 2014: Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not sufficiently. Please clarify how the project will lead to replicable and sustainable financing options for solar energy in industry after the project is complete. DER, March 26, 2012. The response documents important regulatory and financial activities of the project that will support sustainability. Comment cleared.	XT, October 8, 2014 The sustainability of proposed revolving fund is not fully articulated. For details, please check comments in box 13 and 14. DER/XT, November 10, 2014. The description of the revolving fund was clear and complete. Comment cleared.
Project Design	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/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes. At CEO endorsement stage, more descriptions are expected on the existing policies for promotion of solar and the gaps for application of solar in industry. DER, March 26, 2012. Acknowledged for response at CEO endorsement stage.	XT, October 8, 2014 a) A.4.a. Egyptian Energy Sector Overview: please list the three targeted sectors' share of energy consumption in total industry consumption. b) A. 4.4.1. Overview of Current Situation Solar Thermal Technologies in Egypt: please compare Egyptian SWHs prices with those sold in the international market. Simply comparing them with domestic electric or gas prices doesn't justify the need for domestic manufacture.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			DER/XT, November 10, 2014. a) Comment cleared. b) Comment 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?		XT, October 8, 2014 Not yet. See comments in box 13. DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comment cleared.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. a) The investment components are not well defined. Are the demonstration projects going to be financed with grants? b) Please describe in the PIF how non-grant instruments, such as revolving loan programs or risk guarantee programs, or other types of instruments, that will increase availability of financing for solar investments and enhance the supply chain. These could be most applicable in component 3. DER, March 26, 2012. a) & b) Non-grant instrument will be studied during PPG phase and may be used for financing. Comment cleared.	XT, October 8, 2014 a) From the view point of economics, every nation should pursue its absolute advantage in production. This explains why global trade exists and is such an important piece of global economy. If Egypt doesn't have comparative advantages in manufacturing solar water heater components, it could benefit from imports. Please explain why GEF resources should be allocated to support local manufacture. b) The statement in page 17, "the general consensus is the need for government support for the R&DD together with innovation in the financing", suggests that Egypt still has a long way to go before becoming a reliable manufacturer of SWH components. In this regard, please explain why GEF's \$2 million investment in building up manufacturing capacity will be effective and sustainable. DER/XT, November 10, 2014.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>a) The explanation was clear. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not yet.</p> <p>a) Component 1, Strengthening of Policy and Institutional framework includes adoption, which is positive. Please clarify the commitment from Government of Egypt to adopt the policy guidelines.</p> <p>b) Component 2, is shown as an Investment component. Please clarify if any of the funding, either GEF grant or co-financing is for TA. If TA is included, please delineate the TA and Investment portions of this component on two separate rows.</p> <p>c) Component 2. Please clarify how much investment per project is expected. Will the investment portion provide loans for demonstration projects or are these grants?</p> <p>d) Component 3. Please explain how the business model development will be related to the demonstration projects in component 2. Will suppliers of solar technology be eligible for loans? Please consider providing a non-grant instrument that makes it easier for suppliers to scale up business models.</p> <p>e) Component 4. The relative size of component 3 compared to component 4 is good, showing more resources are allocated on scale up.</p> <p>f) The relationship between component 2 (demonstration projects) and component 3 (scale-up) is somewhat confusing. Will the investment</p>	<p>XT, October 8, 2014</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>a) Please explain if the quality control standards developed by EOS and NREA will only apply to domestically made components or also cover internationally sourced components.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>a) Please clarify "pear interest rate" in line 3 of page 26.</p> <p>b) What is the market interest rate for loans investing in renewable energy projects in Egypt? Related to that, how attractive is the revolving fund at an interest rate of 6.5%? Assuming it is attractive, how many projects can the \$2 million fund support?</p> <p>c) What is the scale of the solar thermal systems for 100 pilots? Will all the 100 pilots benefit from the revolving fund?</p> <p>d) Please provide some rational for the numbers of 150, 60, and 20 for outputs 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, and 2.1.2.5.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>a) As stated in box 13, GEF's additionalities for supporting domestic manufacture is not well articulated. Proposed outputs 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4 all suggest that Egypt is lacking some fundamentals in building up its manufacture capacity. Will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>component be used for the pilot projects? Or will a financing facility be established that will provide sustainable funding for scale up? Please clarify. please include the demonstrations in one component and the scale-up and financing in a separate component.</p> <p>g) The inclusion of an investment element in component 3 is positive. How will that element ensure sustainable financing for scale-up after the project is completed? Please clarify.</p> <p>h) The project focuses in applications both in the industrial and the tourist sector. It is not clear if the needs and the opportunities in these two sectors merit an integrated approach with common incentives and technological solutions; please clarify. Also, the different characteristics of the stakeholders from the governmental side and the private sector side might complicate the execution arrangement; please address this issue.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. All comments cleared. Thank you.</p>	<p>GEF's \$ 2 million investment change the game entirely?</p> <p>b) In addition, local manufacture capacity is not critical to deployment of solar thermal energy. China, for example, is the largest manufacturer of solar technologies in the world; the deployment rate in China, however, is much lower than countries that have far smaller manufacture scale, such as Germany and Spain.</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>a) Building up the capacity of technical staff who can design, install and provide maintenance services to solar thermal systems is critical to the technology deployment. Therefore, component 4 may consider designing a mechanism to ensure technical training can sustain and be scaled up, instead of limiting to 200 technicians as proposed by the project.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. The responses were clear, with strong justifications. Comments cleared.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012.</p> <p>a) There are some errors in the project benefits analysis. The figure of 8,000 MW is not credible given the supporting documentation. We also do not understand how the calculation of global environmental benefits was performed.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the expected amount of thermal and electrical capacity</p>	<p>XT, October 8, 2014</p> <p>a) Results Framework table: lack of consistency in units related to CO2 emissions.</p> <p>b) Annex E: Estimated CO2 and Energy Savings: the table indicates that the total energy saving is 855,785 GJ, while the result framework lists as 3,020,795 GJ. Please explain how 3,020,795 GJ energy saving is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>established by the project and ensure that the amount is consistent with the financing and co-financing requested.</p> <p>c) We do not understand the replication estimate based on 3% of Egypt solar potential. Please provide a better estimate based on the sectors that will be demonstrated and supported through the project.</p> <p>DER, August 8, 2012.</p> <p>a) The estimation of benefits has been clarified and expanded. However, the explanation for the figure of 8,000 MW has not been explained. Please explain how the project financing can help create this much solar power by demonstrating the average installation costs for solar power.</p> <p>b) Please provide as requested.</p> <p>c) Please expand on the 3% explanation. Also, the 16,000 million tCO₂e estimate is very high - that is 16 gigatons, which is two times US annual carbon emissions. Perhaps the mathematical notation is using a mixture of european and united states notation.</p> <p>d) The new GEB resulting from assistance to the manufacturing sector is helpful. Please confirm the math - 468 million CO₂e reductions per year for an investment of \$40 million is less than 10 cents per ton reduced. We would not expect to see such high cost-effectiveness. Also, please check that the estimates are based on life of equipment.</p> <p>e) Please rationalize the emissions</p>	<p>estimated?</p> <p>c) Please explain why the difference between bottom-up and top-down emissions is so significant.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. All comments cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>benefit calculation against similar projects, such as #4753 in Pakistan. In that project, a similar investment leads to 150 ktonCO₂e benefits per year.</p> <p>DER, August 29, 2012. a) The correct figure is 8,000 kw or 8MW. Comment cleared. b) The breakdown was provided. Comment cleared. c) & d) Some mathematical errors were corrected. The estimated emissions reductions are 9.5 million tCO₂e over 20 years. At CEO endorsement, please provide a more robust estimation and justify why the bottoms-up estimate is higher than the top-down estimate. Comment cleared. e) After correction, the levels are reasonable. Comment 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>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Incomplete. Please provide a description of the gender dimensions for industry sectors.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. PIF updated. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, October 9, 2014: Yes Gender dimension is covered.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes. At CEO endorsement, please identify specific CSOs and industry associations as partners.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. Acknowledged and will be handled at CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>XT, October 9, 2014: Not yet Public participation dimension is missing.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comment cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. The list of risks is quite low, however, the reference to sustainability risk does not include mention of the risk that sustainable funding mechanisms are not established. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. Risk identified. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, October 9, 2014: Not yet</p> <p>1) Financial risk is high based on current design of revolving fund. For details, please see comments in box 13 and 14.</p> <p>2) Related to the financial risk, the sustainability risk is also high.</p> <p>Please provide more robust mitigation measures to these two risks.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comments cleared.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. To be determined. Please respond to the following comments:</p> <p>a) The provided document summarizing the Government of Egypt GEF-5 project priorities shows several different projects all related to renewable energy, some of which list UNIDO is a candidate Agency. Please clarify how this project will not overlap other projects and whether these projects should be combined.</p> <p>b) The funding level requested in the PIF is higher than the funding level for the project of the same name identified in the Government of Egypt document. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012.</p> <p>a) The efforts have been better coordinated and consolidated. Comments cleared.</p> <p>b) Correct number provided in endorsement letter. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>XT, October 9, 2014: Yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not specified. Please supply. DER, March 26, 2012. Explanation provided. Comment cleared.	XT, October 9, 2014: Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		XT, October 9, 2014: There are some changes in all four components. Particularly, the change in component 2 is significant. The plan for revolving fund needs to be better thought through. Detailed comments are provided in table 14. DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comment cleared.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		XT, October 9, 2014: There is no non-grant instrument DER/XT, November 10, 2014. The non-grant instrument in the project, a revolving fund, does not have expected reflows to the GEF Trust Fund. Comment cleared.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. No. The project management cost exceeds 5% of the GEF requested amount of \$6.2 M. Please adjust to 5% or less of the requested GEF funding amount, or justify the level above 5%. DER, March 26, 2012. Adjusted. Comment cleared.	XT, October 9, 2014: Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. No. a) It appears that co-financing for component 2 is adequate, though funding appears to come only from the Government of Egypt. Please clarify if private sector funding will be used in	XT, October 9, 2014 a) Based on the comments regarding the real effect of investing in component 3, please consider the balance of GEF funding and co-

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the demo projects. b) Co-financing for scale-up is low. Please consider consolidating the scale-up and financing focused in one component, not split across two.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. a) & b) The co-financing numbers have been raised, but there is a disconnect between the level of financing, both GEF requested and co-financing, and the expected deliverables of thermal and electrical capacity. A cost-effective project will have significantly higher levels of solar thermal and electrical capacity added. The project needs to be re-designed and the amount of financing justified consistent with the deliverables. A technical consultation with GEF and agency staff is recommended.</p> <p>DER, August 8, 2012. a) & b) Thank you for adding the estimates of the benefits from component 3. This is helpful, but the math needs to be confirmed. (This also relates to the comment in box 15 and the new estimates provided for GEB on page 11-12 of the PIF.) Please re-confirm the math and re-submit.</p> <p>DER, August 29, 2012. a) & b) The benefits estimate for component 3 has been included. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>financing for the objective. . Especially, the TA part of component 3 could be combined with component 4, which seems to be under-funded due to its importance. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;</p>	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. No. a) Please clarify the role of for private</p>	<p>XT, October 9, 2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>sector co-financing. How is that co-financing divided between the pilots and the scale-up?</p> <p>b) The amount of co-financing from the Government of Egypt is quite good, however, the overall level of co-financing is low approximately 4:1. Please increase the level of co-financing.</p> <p>c) The PIF could be enhanced with additional private sector and local financing through the use of catalytic non-grant instruments. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. a) & b) Please see box 24. c) The use of non-grant instruments needs to be described at the PIF stage before proceeding.</p> <p>DER, August 8, 2012. c) The use of a non-grant instrument based on an existing UNDP model is described. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>Please provide evidence of clear co-financing commitment from:</p> <p>a) National Bank of Egypt (NBE). Although there is a letter from NBE, the letter didn't specify a commitment of \$2,000,000 loan.</p> <p>b) Commercial International Bank (CIB). Although there is a letter from CIB, the letter didn't specify a commitment of \$20,000,000 hard-loan.</p> <p>c) Social Development Fund (SDF). Although there is a letter from SDF, the letter didn't specify a commitment of \$11,500,000 loan.</p> <p>d) Letter indicating a cash support of \$1,000,000 is missing.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Comments cleared.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.	XT, October 9, 2014: Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		XT, October 9, 2014: Yes
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		XT, October 9, 2014: Yes
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? 	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	DER/XT, November 10, 2014. Yes.
		DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. NA	NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not at this time. Please respond to comments in boxes: 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, and 25. Also please pay attention to box 31 for items requested at CEO endorsement. Please coordinate PIF re-submission and responses with the related project 4788 (India).</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012. Not at this time. Please see comments in boxes 14, 24, and 25. Additional work is needed to prepare a sound analysis of the energy capacity and emissions benefits of the project; and to ensure that GEF requested resources are delivering substantial renewable energy capacity in a cost-effective manner. Also, we need to see more description of how non-grant instruments would be included in the project.</p> <p>DER, August 8, 2012. Not at this time. Comments in box 25 was addressed. Comments in box 15 and 24 need additional response. Please supply.</p> <p>DER, August 29, 2012. Yes. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. a) Confirmed letters of co-financing from all partners are expected.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) Please explore options for the use of non-grant instruments that could help enhance and attract more local private sector financing.</p> <p>c) At CEO endorsement stage, more detailed descriptions of the baseline project are needed, specifically existing policies for promotion of solar and the gaps for application of solar in industry.</p> <p>d) please identify specific CSOs and industry associations as partners.</p> <p>DER, March 26, 2012.</p> <p>e) We expect to see a more detailed analysis supporting the estimate for global environmental benefits.</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?		XT, October 9, 2014: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>XT, October 9, 2014: Not at this time. Please address comments above in boxes: 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 24, and 25.</p> <p>DER/XT, November 10, 2014. All comments cleared. This project is technically cleared and can be submitted for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 21, 2011	October 09, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2012	November 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 2012	
	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?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. No. Most of the components of the PPG are appropriate. What is missing is an analysis of financial and market opportunities for sustainable financial mechanisms in partnership with private sector and local financial institutions. This should be added to the PPG in order to build the necessary understanding and mechanisms to support components 2 and 3 of the PIF. DER, March 26, 2012. Analysis and consultation added. Comment cleared.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	DER/DZ, December 21, 2011. Not at this time. a) Please address comments in Box 1 b) The PPG form is not signed. c) The proposed time scale for the PPG, from March 2012 to August 2013, is 18 months. The CEO endorsement must be submitted and approved within 18 months under GEF-5, and therefore the project design phase must be shorter to accommodate sufficient time for submission, review, and endorsement. Please rectify. d) Please coordinate the project preparation with the related project 4788 (India). DER, March 26, 2012. All comments cleared. UNIDO understands the PPG must be completed in sufficient time to meet all GEF cycle requirements.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 21, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2012

* 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.