



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

GEF ID:	<b>9561</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Guinea-Bissau</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promoting Better Access to Modern Energy Services through Sustainable Mini-grids and Low-carbon Bioenergy Technologies Among Guinea-Bissau's Forest-dependent Communities</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5885 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$90,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,912,702</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$9,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$11,912,702</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ming Yang</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Saliou Toure</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MY 7/20/2016 Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 7/20/2016  Not completed yet.  The Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (2015) of Guinea-Bissau specifies a target of increasing the country's energy supply up to a level	

<sup>1</sup> 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
		<p>of 80% renewable energy by 2030 and 80% access to electricity by 2030. GHG reductions will come mainly from the energy, agriculture and forestry sectors.</p> <p>This project will help the country to develop low carbon technologies in forest-dependent local communities.</p> <p>But the PIF does not indicate how much this GEF project will contribute to the INDC goal of 80% RE. Can the Agency quantitatively estimate the contribution, say contributing to 5 or 10% of renewable energy to the country by 2030?</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not completed yet.</p> <p>While justifying sustainability of the project, please show how operation and maintenance costs of the 2 MW demonstration sub-projects will be covered after the GEF project implementation period is over.</p> <p>While justifying scaling up of the project, please show how the policy,</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>financing model and business model to be created through this project will be further applied to other part of the country.</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not yet at this time.</p> <p>Components 1 and 2 are all in policy and financial instrument development. Please merge the outputs and outcomes of the two components into one. It is suggested that the GEF budget for the existing Component 2 be reallocated to Component 4 (INV) and a new component for project monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E).</p> <p>Justification of Component 3, capacity building, is not strong. Please put targeted numbers in there. For example, the number of copies of guidebook to be printed, the number of plant installers to be trained, etc. must be put in Table B on page 2. Please consider reducing the budget for Component 3 if the targeted numbers of outputs are not significant.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not yet at this time. Please see comments in Box 4. In addition, the total project costs amount to over \$12 million. Please consider increasing the targeted amount of installed RE power generation capacity in the demonstration sub-projects, which is currently 2 MW in the PIF.</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not yet at this time. Please indicate how this project will engage indigenous people and CSOs.</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
		<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not yet at this time. The total available STAR funds as of</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>July 20, 2016 for this country was \$3,287,959. This project's budget is larger than the available amount. Please reduce the project budget accordingly.</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and the project budget was reduced.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 Not yet at this time. The country is flexible in STAR utilization. But the total available STAR resource cannot cover the budget. See comments in the previous box.</p> <p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and the project budget was reduced.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 N/A</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>MY 7/20/2016 In general, the PIF looks not bad, but it needs more work. Please address the comments in Boxes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MY 8/3/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p> <p>However, the targeted global environmental benefit, namely directly reducing 190,288 tonnes of CO2 equivalent, is not significant. In the PPG stage, the Agency must undertake more detailed analysis in quantifying GHG emission reductions using GEF standardized GHG accounting methodologies. In addition to direct emission reductions, the amount of indirect GHG emission reduction should also be estimated and presented at the CEO Endorsement Request stage.</p> <p>The PM recommends PIF technical clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.