



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

GEF ID:	<b>5286</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Equatorial Guinea</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Energy for All: Promoting Small Scale Hydropower in Bioko and Other Clean Energy Solutions for Remote Islands</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5143 (UNDP)</b>
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-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,502,968</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$40,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$43,652,968</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Alex Njuguna Waithera</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)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	ANW, February 11,2013: Yes	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	ANW, February 11,2013: Yes, by letter signed on January 8th, 2013	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	ANW, February 11,2013: The total STAR allocation for Equatorial Guinea is US\$ 4 million while the CC allocation is US\$2 million. The proposed project requests US\$ 4 million, under the flexibility rule. The US\$4 million includes project preparation cost, project cost and agency fees.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	ANW, February 11,2013: Yes	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	ANW, February 11,2013: Yes. Equatorial Guinea's Initial National Communication (INC) to the UNFCCC is under development, with a key focus on identifying the mitigation options suitable to the country. Its finalization will be informed by national mid-term development and energy policy frameworks-respectively, the National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) "Horizon 2020", and the National Electrification Plan (NEP)-as well as international long-term initiatives, such as the global Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) initiative. The importance of access to energy is also confirmed by the country's commitment of its entire STAR allocation under the GEF-5 to its first climate change mitigation project.	
	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> ,	ANW, February 13,2013: No. The	

Project Design	baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	strengthened. It is unclear how the new project will build upon baseline activities, especially for solar and wind. The PIF is silent about the baseline activities related to solar and wind. ANW, March 14,2013: According to the Agency,there are no background solar or wind interventions in the country. The resource assessments will inform potential to replicate/scale-up in various renewable energy technologies. Comment Cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes	

	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>ANW, February 13,2013. No. Please describe clearly how the activities of the proposed project will be coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region.</p> <p>ANW, March 14, 2013: The project will be implemented by MPM with MMIE and SEGESA, in direct coordination with all activities Equatorial Guinea plans to undertake related to the Sustainable Energy For ALL (SE4ALL) initiative.</p> <p>Comment Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>ANW, February 13,2013. Yes, the project is innovative as it will promote a reduced dependence on fossil fuel generated electricity in Equatorial Guinea, particularly its island regions, with increased access and consideration of cleaner energy resource (e.g. small scale hydro, solar and wind power). The proposed project will also address the weakness of the country's policy,market and institutional frameworks for supporting renewable energy development.</p> <p>ANW, February 13,2013. Please clarify how the activities of the project will be sustained after project closure. Also please clarify how this project will lead to large-scale replication.</p> <p>ANW, March 14, 2013: The project will initially support development of hydropower demonstrations of a total 4.2MW (in Riaba and Musola) and will be replicated to an additional 10MW in Ilachi Plant, and will boost the planned 200MW hydro investments in the mainland. Comment Cleared.</p>	

	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	ANW, February 13,2013. No. The co-financing provided by UNDP is 1.25% of the total co-financing. Also the co-financing provided by UNDP is in-kind. Please consider increasing the UNDP co-financing to reflect its role.  ANW, March 14, 2013: According to the Agency, UNDP's co-financing to this initiative represents 20% of its core resources for the next 5 years. It has been clarified that UNDP contribution is in cash and not in-kind as captured earlier. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes. The project management cost provided is 5% of the GEF-grant subtotal.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>	ANW, February 13,2013. Yes the PPG is requested and approved.	

	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	ANW, February 13, 2013. This is grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	ANW, February 13, 2013: Not at this time. Please address the comments in boxes 6, 12, 13 and 17.  ANW, March 14, 2013: The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. <b>Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	February 13, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 25, 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.**