



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

GEF ID:	5331		
Country/Region:	Guinea-Bissau		
Project Title:	Creation of an Enabling Environment for Small to Medium Scale Renewable Energy Investments in the Electricity Sector		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$1,735,160
Co-financing:	\$7,450,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,276,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Alex Njuguna Waithera	Agency Contact Person:	Martin Lugmayr

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 ?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes, the CC Allocation is US\$ 2 million which is within the funding requested by the proposed project. The US\$ 2million requested includes project preparation cost, project cost and agency fees. Guinea-Bissau is also a flexible country	

		from its STAR allocation of US\$ 4,600,000.	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes, the project is aligned with CCM-3 Strategic objective.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes, the project is fully in line with the energy and climate policy of Guinea Bissau. The promotion of renewable energy has been included as a key activity in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), covering the period 2011 to 2015, the national energy policy and the ECOWAS Regional Renewable Energy Policy. Recently, the ECOWAS member states (including Guinea Bissau) adopted a regional policy for renewable energy which aims at increasing the share of renewables (excl. large hydro) to 19% of the overall electricity mix of the region by 2030.	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	

Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Please provide an estimate of CO2 emission reduction potential from the project at the PIF stage. At the time of CEO approval, more detailed calculations are expected. ANW, April 9, 2013: CO2 Emission reduction estimates have been provided. Comment cleared.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	ANW, March 25, 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	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	

	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes, the project is innovative as it will provide a strong technical south-south partnership between Guinea Bissau and the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE). The lessons learned from the GEF project will be disseminated to other ECOWAS countries through the ECOWAS Observatory for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency. To ensure the replication of the demonstration projects a national renewable energy investment plan, an enabling policy framework and a financing facility will be created. The capacity building activities will use a train-the-trainers approach to ensure continuity after the completion of the GEF project.	
	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, March 25, 2013: Yes	

	17. <u>At PIE</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, March 25, 2013: Yes	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes	
	19. <u>At PIE</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> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	ANW, March 25, 2013: Yes, a PPG of US\$91,324 is requested.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	ANW, March 25, 2013: This is a grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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	being recommended?	Please address the comment in box 8. ANW, April 9, 2013: The PIF has been technically cleared and is being recommended for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	ANW, March 25, 2013: a) Confirmation and detailed analysis of GHG emission reduction figures.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 25, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 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.**