



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

GEF ID:	<b>5154</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kenya</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Conversion of Waste to Clean Energy for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</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-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,999,998</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$9,824,718</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$11,924,716</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>December 17, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ming Yang</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Josy Thomas</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes. Kenya ratified the UNFCCC on Aug 30, 1994	MY 6/2/2015 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes, by letter dating June 7, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: This question will be considered once the other comments are addressed.  FJ - July 12, 2013: Please clarify which financial institution UNIDO is considering partnering with for the financial mechanism of component 3 since UNIDO may not have a comparative advantage in this	MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>domain.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Please address 14 g) and clarify the experience of the financial institutions partners regarding the considered financial mechanism of component 3.</p> <p>FJ - Dec 12, 2013: Comment cleared.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: The project is a grant	MY 6/2/2015 The project uses GEF grant only.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes	MY 6/2/2015 Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		MY 6/2/2015 Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: The project requests \$2.48 million of GEF CCM funding, while the remaining country's CCM allocation is \$3.49 million. However, the Kenyan focal point signed endorsement letters for 2 other projects involving CCM for a total of \$4.4 million of CCM funding. Clarifications from the focal point are expected regarding which project it wishes to pursue and which project it wishes to withdraw.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: The GEF secretariat is waiting for an official letter from the Kenyan focal</p>	MY 6/2/2015 Yes, the GEF grant has been set-aside for the project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>point to the GEF CEO to clarify the situation by providing letters withdrawing the endorsement given to projects it does not wish to endorse any further.</p> <p>FJ â€œ July 12, 2013: Please contact the GEF secretariat regarding the remaining CCM allocation for Kenya under GEF-5.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes	MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes, CCM-3.	MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.
	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?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Please address the consistency of the project with Kenya's National Communication, Technology Needs Assessment and National Portfolio Document.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Thank you for the clarifications. Please</p>	MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>address the consistency of the project with Kenya's National Portfolio Document.</p> <p>FJ â€œ July 12, 2013: Cleared</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: No. a) Component 1 proposes to set up a learning center on waste-to-energy, however this center would only engage university staff when stakeholders interested in developing waste-to-energy projects are likely to require very practical information and support by experienced engineers, technicians and/or managers. Please consider designing capacity development means and access modes that would be more adapted to such needs. b) Please clarify how the project will ensure that the capacity development means may be sustained over time. Please also explain how the project will take into account that policy makers (a target for capacity development) change over time.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: a) The response provided does not clear the previous comment. Please clarify how stakeholders interested in developing waste-to-energy projects will be able to find support by experienced engineers, technicians and/or managers through the proposed center. Please clarify in particular from</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>where would come the Engineers/project managers &amp; consultants considered to provide training and whether the considered fee system would be able to cover costs if those trainers would come from afar. Please also clarify whether the training provided would only be theoretical or also practical.</p> <p>FJ â€œ July 12, 2013:  a) The response provided by UNIDO refers to a fee mechanism to sustain financial means for the learning platform. Such system is interesting and will have to be detailed at CEO endorsement stage. However, no clear mention of such mechanism could be found in the PIF. Please revise the PIF to include a clear mention of such mechanism.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013:  Cleared</p>	
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?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012:  a) It is not clear yet why JICA, usually interested in developing carbon credits generating projects, would not try to put methane to use once it has managed to collect it. Please clarify.  b) Please provide the source of the reference made to a US EPA rule of thumb concerning the viability limits of landfill methane capture and clarify the relevance of such rule in a climate and an environment different from the USA.  c) Please describe the list of barriers</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015  Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>page 9-10 in less generic terms to clarify what exactly is the barriers faced by stakeholders. Please also consider ranking these barriers by order of importance.</p> <p>d) Please clarify the conditions required to enable the project's sites to export their produced electricity to the grid.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012:</p> <p>a) cleared</p> <p>b) For CEO endorsement, details are expected on the economics of the landfill project and its relevance in the actual conditions of Nairobi.</p> <p>c) Please review the third barrier presented for "Biogas from Slaughterhouse waste" as it appear to be relevant for the landfill sub-project and not the slaughterhouse one.</p> <p>d) The response does not fully clarify the previous comment. Please clarify the conditions set by the existing regulatory and contractual framework to enable the project's sites to export their produced electricity to the grid (and assess whether these are sufficient).</p> <p>FJ - July 12, 2013:</p> <p>d) The response does not yet address the previous comment. The PIF clearly mentions the possibility for industries involved in the project to export excess of power to the grid. Please clarify the conditions set by the existing regulatory and contractual frameworks to enable the project sites to export their produced</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>electricity to the grid (and assess whether these are sufficient).</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes, it is described on pages 41 and 42 of the CEO Approval document.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: a) Please address Q11 to allow for assessing this question. b) Please clarify what is meant page 4 by "Waste to energy technologies [were chosen] due to their rapid scaling-up".</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: a) Please address Q11 to allow for assessing this question. b) Thank you for the clarifications. The response provided highlights potential sectors for replication, but does not indicate why replication might be particularly rapid. Please either provide additional elements supporting the potential high speed of replication or consider deleting the assertion.</p> <p>FJ - July 12, 2013: b) Thank you for the clarification. Please address Q14f) and g).</p> <p>FJ - Dec 12, 2013: Cleared.</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF stage and repeated on page 14.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012:</p> <p>a) The project seems mainly focused on one shot investments and does not seem to include activities that would ensure spreading the use of the proposed technical solutions in all places in Kenyan where similar issues and opportunities exist. Please consider adding activities aimed at designing and putting in place sustainable mechanisms that would allow such transformational replications at the country level.</p> <p>b) Please clarify why the UNIDO's pilot plant of 10kWe at Dagoretti's slaughterhouse has not been sufficient to trigger further development of waste-to-energy plants by the company or other enterprises in the area. Please also clarify why the new demonstration proposed would make a difference in triggering such change.</p> <p>c) In the project framework table, the co-financing of Component 3 is likely to be INV instead of TA. Please separate INV and TA outcomes, outputs and financing into two different rows.</p> <p>d) Please clarify how the project will address potential issues on the quality of digested residues for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>e) Please note that the GEF cannot fund greenhouse gases emission reduction activities that would lead to the selling of CDM credits. Please clarify the project's objective on this matter, to demonstrate that there is no double-counting.</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>1. Please write a note for Table B to explain which outputs have got co-financing cuts. The total reduced co-financing amount should be \$2.72 (\$9.57-\$6.85) million.</p> <p>2. Please provide a table showing outputs in the PIF and CEO Approval.</p> <p>3. Please consider increasing co-financing amount to \$9.57 million as in the PIF stage. With the amount of co-financing proposed in the GEF Approval, the co-financing ratio is 1:3.4 which is well below the average ratio of the climate change mitigation portfolio.</p> <p>MY 7/15/2015: Yes. Comments have been addressed. The CEO ER document has be revised accordingly on pages 3, 5, and 6. Co-financing letters have been provided.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>f) Please clarify the rationale behind putting two dissociated, seemingly unrelated activities in one project. Component 2 (landfill methane valorisation) and Component 3 (industrial waste digesters) appear to be completely dissociated without apparent link or complementarity.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012:  a) Thank you for the clarifications. Please provide copy of the agreement expressed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Environment regarding the policies making the use of the considered technologies mandatory, where applicable, and briefly explain how the government will find the means to design and enforce such policy. Regarding the landfill part of the project, the elements provided to support the replication potential are not sufficient as lack of information may not be the only key barrier. Please provide more concrete elements or consider adding activities aimed at designing and putting in place sustainable mechanisms that would allow such transformational replications at the country level.  b) Thank you for the clarifications. Details are expected for CEO endorsement on how the new demonstration proposed (in the slaughterhouses) will enable to make changes happen that did not occur with the initial pilot at Dagoretti</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>slaughterhouse.</p> <p>c) Thank you for the clarifications. For component 3, please clarify which output are TA and which are INV (please note that feasibility studies are to be classified as INV).</p> <p>d) Thank you for the clarifications. The response provided does not address potential quality issues related to other than the fertilizing property of the sludge (e.g. heavy metal content, plastic waste content, etc.). Please clarify.</p> <p>e) Thank you for the clarifications. Please indicate in the PIF that the project will not lead to CER benefits.</p> <p>f) Thank you for the clarifications. The proposed project appears to be in fact two different projects presented in a single PIF for convenience and reduced administrative burden. Please note that for CEO endorsement a detailed presentation of the implementation structure and process is expected to ensure that (i) the two sub-projects will have adequate technical means and support, and that (ii) all cross-cutting issues, if any, can be identified and properly addressed. Please briefly address these issues in the PIF to allow further assessment of Q20.</p> <p>FJ/ANW â€œ July 12, 2013:  d) Please clarify how the project will ensure that chemical analysis of the bio waste produced by the WTE plants will continue to be undertaken once the project is running to ensure its</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>suitability for farming use.</p> <p>With the withdrawal of UNEP from the project, the PIF has significantly been modified. The following elements would need to be clarified:</p> <p>f) Please justify (in terms of relative cost and potential) the focus of the project on WTE options as renewable energy sources compared to other available options in Kenya.</p> <p>g) The issue at stake for electricity consumption trends in Kenya is clearly presented part B.1. page 5: Kenya needs to increase its electricity production by 14 GW in the next 15 years. By comparison, the proposed project's objective appears to have a very marginal potential impact with a few additional MW of renewable energy production considered over 10 years even through its indirect impact. Solving this concern lies in part in the incentive facility system considered under Component 3. However, this facility is only vaguely presented. Please (i) clarify the type of incentive considered, (ii) explain why such incentive would be adapted to WTE projects based on the financial issues faced by stakeholders willing to develop such projects, (iii) clarify how the project will design the transition from a 26% subsidy (component 2) to a more sustainable mechanism, (iv) clarify how the financial scale of the incentive facility system has been defined and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>what amount of investment and energy production can be expected from it, (v) clarify how the project will help demonstrate the effectiveness of this incentive facility system and how it will help securing additional funding for it.</p> <p>h) As the barrier analysis acknowledge access to finance as important for commercial development of WTE projects in Kenya, please justify why component 2 considers a pure grant of 26% of the needed investments in the 4 demonstration plants. Please also clarify why the financial support provided to those 4 demonstration plants is not designed to make use and test the financial mechanism of component 3.</p> <p>i) Please clarify how this project will contribute to rural electrification while many of the biogas power plants will be located in the urban areas.</p> <p>j) The PIF mentions there is biogas power generation potential in agro-sectors including coffee, fruits, sugar and sisal. However, the proposed project is targeting mainly the slaughter house sectors. Please clarify whether this project will help to tap the biogas power generation potential in other waste streams such as horticulture, coffee and tea wastes that could benefit from biogas technology.</p> <p>k) Please clarify how maintenance and repairs of installed biogas systems will be conducted even after closure of the GEF project. In other words, who will finance the maintenance or repairs of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the installed systems and will there be a critical mass of trained technicians who can be able to do this service?</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013:  d) Cleared.  f) A quick comparison between the investment costs per kWh seems to show that biogas options are always more expensive than other renewable energy production options. Moreover, this does not take into account operation and maintenance costs that could be higher for biogas. This raises the question of the justification of the project focus on WTE options for renewable energy development in Kenya. The only clear advantage of this option seems to be the disposal of existing waste. However, given the apparent high cost of WTE, one wonders if it might be economically viable without continued long-term public subsidies. Please clarify.  g) Component 3 is a key component for the sustainability and scaling up capacity of the project. The current proposal leaves too many elements to be developed during PPG stage. The proposal needs to include (i) the incentive mechanism considered at this stage, (ii) partners that have experience in developing and sustaining such mechanism, (iii) a rough description of how the mechanism may evolve over time to become cost-effective and financially sustainable, and (iv) a view</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of what source of financing may be secured for the incentive mechanism. Besides, the co-financing presented in the PIF for this component is not clear: one would expect that most of the funding for component 3 would be cash going to incentivize investments; component 3 is currently presented as TA (without any INV) and the co-financing amount presented (\$3.99 million) does not seem consistent with the amounts of grant co-financing listed in table C. Please clarify.</p> <p>h) Please consider designing the financial support of component 2 in a similar way to the considered financial mechanism of component 3.</p> <p>i) Cleared.</p> <p>j) Details are expected at CEO endorsement on the technical and financial issues specific to expanding biogas development to other waste streams such as horticulture, coffee and tea wastes; and on how the project will enable to tackle these issues.</p> <p>k) Cleared.</p> <p>FJ â€œ Dec 12, 2013:</p> <p>f) Thank you for the clarifications. Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) Thank you for the additional information. By CEO approval request, it is expected that details will be provided on (i) how the subsidy support to WTE projects will decrease over time during project implementation and after project completion; (ii) how the project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>will secure funding sources to enable the subsidy scheme to continue beyond project completion. Details will also be expected on the project partners for the financing incentive and on their previous experience in setting up and managing the proposed financial mechanism.</p> <p>h) For CEO approval, details are expected on how the financial support provided under component 2 will embed and enable to test the financial mechanism of component 3.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please clarify how the amount of 150,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e over 20 years has been estimated for the Dandora dumpsite activities. Please also clarify why the table page 16 indicates that these are annual emission reductions.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the conversion factor used to convert MWh produced into CO<sub>2</sub>e savings.</p> <p>c) Please justify the 20 years lifetime for biogas electricity generation investments. Please also revise the number provided for the cumulative direct emission reduction as it appears incorrect in pages 17 and 18.</p> <p>d) Since no mechanism is proposed by the project at this stage to enable further similar investments, the estimated indirect carbon benefits do not seem to be justified. Please revise, or explain.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please provide, as an annex, a brief</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015</p> <p>Yes. As cleared in the PIF stage and summarized on pages 14 and 30 in the CEO Approval document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>presentation of the emission reduction estimates calculations for the Dandora dumpsite activities, along with the appropriate references.</p> <p>b) Cleared c) Cleared d) Please address Q15 a) above to allow further assessment of this point.</p> <p>FJ â€™ July 12, 2013: 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>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Since the project involves private sector's investments, please consider involving stakeholders from the financial sphere (e.g. private banks)</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Thank you for the modifications. Please consider involving the commercial banks' and financial institutions' stakeholder earlier and more in depth in the project, with the objective of having them part take in the co-financing of the investments to be developed by the sub-projects when possible.</p> <p>FJ â€™ July 12, 2013: Please address Q3.</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Please address Q3.</p> <p>FJ - Dec 12, 2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<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>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Please identify existing initiatives on waste to energy in the region and clarify the relation they may have to this project.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Cleared</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes, as stated on page 33.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: This question will be considered once the other comments are addressed.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Please briefly explain in the PIF how the project will address the issues raised in Q14 f).</p> <p>FJ/ANW - July 12, 2013: a) Since the project includes the development of a financial mechanism that would require sustainable funding sources, please consider involving the Kenyan Ministry of Finance in the design and implementation of the project. b) There is no mention of the Ministry</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of Energy (MoE) in the PIF. Please consider identifying the role of MoE in project execution, especially when it comes to policy and regulatory issues affecting medium size to large scale biogas technology.</p> <p>c) Please consider the role of Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) in project execution, especially when it comes to the development and enforcement of technical standards for medium size to large scale biogas technology.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Comments cleared</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>MY 6/2/2015</p> <p>Not really at this time.</p> <p>The executing agency has been changed, which led to a significant reduction of co-financing from \$9.57 million to \$6.85 million, and caused the co-financing ratio less than 1:3.5 for this project.</p> <p>The Agency stated in the CEO Approval document (page 4) that "... efforts will be taken to secure co-financing contribution from the identified stakeholders and increase the co-financing amount during project implementation...". The GEF SEC propose that the Agency make efforts now (before the project implementation) to secure more co-financing contribution from the private sector, and increase the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>co-financing to the same amount as in the PIF stage.</p> <p>MY 7/16/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the co-financing amount was increased.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.</p>
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Yes. They represent 10% of the requested grant.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Correction on the previous comment. Please reduce slightly the total GEF grant requested to go below the \$2 million threshold since this would otherwise trigger a maximum for project management cost of 5% of the GEF grant.</p> <p>FJ - July 12, 2013: Please contact the GEF secretariat regarding the remaining CCM allocation for Kenya under GEF-5.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Cleared</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes.</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Please clarify why the Slaughterhouses co-financing in table C is \$2.7 million while the co-financing of the corresponding Component 2 indicates only \$2.4 million.</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Not at this time. Comments will be provided after the comments in Box 21 is cleared.</p> <p>MY 7/16/2015</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Cleared.</p> <p>FJ â€œ July 12, 2013: The incremental cost associated with the 4 demonstration plants (\$5.2 million) presented page 12 is not consistent with the budget allocated to component 2 (\$5.5 million). Please clarify.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: Cleared</p>	<p>Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: The co-financing ration is 1:6.3</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: The co-financing ration is 1:6.4</p> <p>FJ â€œ July 12, 2013: The co-financing ration is 1:4.8</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Not at this time. The co-financing letters for the reduced amounts are provided. But the total co-financing amount has been significantly reduced. Please consider securing more co-financing from the private sector.</p> <p>MY 7/16/2015 Yes. New co-financing letters have been provided.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: The co-financing provided by UNEP represents 5.8% of the total co-financing. The co-financing provided by UNIDO represents 0.4% of the total co-financing. Please consider increasing UNIDO's co-financing.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Cleared. The cofinancing provided by UNIDO represents 1.1% of the total co-financing.</p>	<p>MY 6/2/2015 Yes, the Agency will provide \$60,000 cash and \$90,000 in-kind contribution to the project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ â€“ July 12, 2013: The cofinancing provided by UNIDO represents 1.6% of the total co-financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		MY 6/2/2015 Yes. But the Tracking Tool was prepared on the basis of reduced co-financing amount. It should be revised when the co-financing amount is increased to the same amount as in the PIF stage.  MY 7/16/2015 Yes. A revised tracking tool has been provided.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		MY 6/2/2015 Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	• Convention Secretariat?		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	• Council comments?		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		MY 6/2/2015 Not applicable.
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	FJ - Sep 20, 2012: No. Please address the comments above.  FJ - Oct 22, 2012: No. Please address the remaining	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>comments above. Please communicate with the GEFSEC in order to discuss the above comments prior to re-submission.</p> <p>FJ â€™ July 12, 2013: No. Please address the remaining comments above. Please communicate with the GEFSEC in order to discuss the above comments prior to re-submission.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: No. a) Please address the remaining comments above. b) Please communicate with the GEFSEC in order to discuss the above remaining comments prior to re-submission. c) Please use the new PIF template (<a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708">http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708</a>) that include a PPG section and does not necessitate a separate PPG submission.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Dec 12, 2013: Yes. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>FJ â€™ July 12, 2013: a) Details are expected for CEO endorsement the fee mechanism to sustain financial means for the learning platform. b) Details are expected for CEO endorsement on how the new demonstration proposed (in the slaughterhouses) will enable to make changes happen that did not occur with</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the initial pilot at Dagoretti slaughterhouse.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 18, 2013: c) Details are expected at CEO endorsement on the technical and financial issues specific to expanding biogas development to other waste streams such as horticulture, coffee and tea wastes; and on how the project will enable to tackle these issues.</p> <p>FJ - Dec 12, 2013: d) By CEO approval request, it is expected that details will be provided on (i) how the subsidy support to WTE projects will decrease over time during project implementation and after project completion; (ii) how the project will secure funding sources to enable the subsidy scheme to continue beyond project completion. e) Details are also expected on the project partners for the financing incentive and on their previous experience in setting up and managing the proposed financial mechanism. f) For CEO approval, details are expected on how the financial support provided under component 2 will embed and enable to test the financial mechanism of component 3.</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?		MY 6/2/2015 Yes. On page 51.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>MY 6/2/2015 Not at this time. Please: 1. Address comments in Boxes: 21, 24, 25, and 27. 2. Prepare a table to explicitly show how the GEF's comments in Box 31 at the PIF stage have been addressed in the CEO Approval document.</p> <p>MY 7/16/2015 Yes. All comments have been addressed and issues have been cleared</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2012	June 02, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 22, 2012	July 16, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 12, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 18, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 12, 2013	

\* **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?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG</p>



		<p>will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>FJ - Sep 20, 2012: No. Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p> <p>FJ - Oct 22, 2012: No. Please revise the PIF and adjust the PPG accordingly. Further review of the PPG will be provided once the PIF has been technically cleared.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2012
	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.