



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

GEF ID:	4336		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Lighting One Million Lives in Liberia		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	124014 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3; CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,454,540
Co-financing:	\$4,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,504,540
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

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?	Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Yes. Ambassador Sylvester M. Grigsby, Deputy Minister for International cooperative and Economic Integration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, endorsed total funding of US\$ 4,950,000 in letter dated August 31, 2010</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010: The Deputy Minister is not listed as the operational focal point on the GEF web-site. The GEF has sent a letter to the Government of Liberia seeking formal designation of the operational focal point. Please</p>	

*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>submit the project proposal for proper endorsement by the operational focal point in Liberia before re-submitting the PIF to GEF.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. A new endorsement letter is provided, signed by Anyaa Vohir, GEF OFP. The letter is dated March 11, 2011. Please clarify - is this endorsement letter for the stand-alone PIF or for the Lighting Africa PFD?</p> <p>DER, April 6, 2011. The response clarifies that Liberia's letter supports the PIF as the first project to expand Lighting Africa and that the effort will be fully integrated with the Lighting Africa PFD when that commences. Comment cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	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"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. The request of \$4.95M is within the STAR allocation of \$5.04 million for Liberia.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Subsequent to the first PIF review, other project endorsement's by the Liberian operational focal point have raised questions on whether there is sufficient STAR allocation to handle all the projects. The GEF has sent a letter to the Government of Liberia seeking confirmation of which projects are being endorsed within the STAR allocation. Once endorsement is confirmed, please clarify the amount requested.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. The endorsement letter is \$1.6M. This is within the STAR allocation for Climate Change for Liberia. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>No.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. Additional analysis of the PIF shows that the requested amount exceeds the allocation for climate change and would require access to the full STAR allocation from all focal areas. The request of \$4.95M will require all focal point allocations to be combined for this project. This is a decision that must be endorsed by the Government of Liberia and consistent with their national goals and plans. The GEF has sent a letter to the Government of Liberia seeking confirmation of which projects are being endorsed within the STAR allocation. Once endorsement is confirmed, please clarify the amount requested.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. Comment cleared.</p>	

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"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. Table A, Focal Area Strategy Framework is not filled in properly. Please follow the published GEF guidance and use the allowed wording for the CCM-3 Objectives (shown below). The data currently in the Table is good, but should be presented in other parts of the document, such as the Table B.</p> <p>FYI, the allowable outcomes language for CCM-3 is: Outcome 3.1: Favorable policy and regulatory environment created for renewable energy investments Indicator 3.1: Extent to which RE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced (score of 1 to 5) Outcome 3.2: Investment in renewable energy technologies increased Indicator 3.2: Volume of investment mobilized</p> <p>The allowable outputs language is: Output 3.1: Renewable energy policy and regulation in place Output 3.2: Renewable energy capacity</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>installed Output 3.3: Electricity and heat produced from renewable sources</p> <p>DER, April 6, 2011. Language has been adjusted. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>No. The CC Strategic Objective on Enabling Activities "CCM-6" refers to Enabling Activities under the UNFCCC only. Its is not appropriate to use this for capacity building within common projects under other strategic objectives. Instead, outputs and outcomes related to capacity building should be identified under the appropriate focal area objective (in this case CCM-3). Please correct your statements on this in Table A and in section A.1.2.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010: Thank you. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>Yes. According to the PIF, this project is consistent with the Liberian National Energy Policy which calls for universal access to energy that is affordable, sustainable, and environmentally friendly.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>No. Although there is a summary of existing efforts and the baseline project, the elements of the baseline project and the proposed incremental project are not clearly delineated. Please clarify if the micro-hydropower station and mini-grid</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>are part of the baseline project.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. Thank you for clarifying that the micro-hydropower and mini-grid are part of the baseline project. However, additional detail is still needed to clearly understand the elements of the baseline project for solar lanterns and SSMP. Please clarify how much will be accomplished without the GEF support.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. The baseline description is adequate. Comment cleared.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes. The additional activities will provide strong focus in the identified areas.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. Please clarify if the solar lanterns and sustainable solar market packages are the only two technologies in the proposed project and clarify the priority to be placed on each of the technologies.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010: Thank you. Comment cleared. We look forward to more details in the project design documents.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. A new issue has</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>been introduced by the World Bank which proposes to include the Liberia project under a program framework for Lighting Africa. The description of the Liberia project in the PIF and the "same" Liberia project under the program framework differ in wording. Please clarify if these are one and the same project and make any needed changes to the component description in the PIF. Please also clarify the coordination with Lighting Africa of the Liberia PIF if it proceeds as a stand-alone project.</p> <p>DER, April 6, 2011. The re-submission indicates clearly that the Liberia project will be the first expansion of Lighting Africa as the vanguard for the Lighting Africa program framework. Comment cleared.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. The general description of methodology and assumptions appears sound, but is qualitative.	
	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?	Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes. For Component 3, Lighting Liberia, the engagement with Lighting Africa is important and the emphasis on strong quality assurance is critical.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. Component 3 is now missing. Please clarify how coordination with other Lighting Africa initiatives will be conducted.</p> <p>DER, April 6, 2011. The resubmission explains that component 3 is now component 2 and the activities are properly described. coordination is described well. Comment cleared.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. There is no explanation or justification for the specific elements of the management cost so it is deemed to high. Please provide an explanation and justification of the proposed elements of management cost for each of the executing agencies and clarify the pro-	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>rata share of management costs for each of the co-financiers.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. Thank you for the updated estimates which show a more appropriate pro-rata share. A final decision on management cost is reserved until the endorsement stage. Comment cleared.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 14, 2011. Please note the guidelines for project management have changed since the prior submission. The GEF project management cost is capped at 5% of GEF funding, not included fees, unless there is strong justification for a larger level. If the IBRD will be conducting project management in-house, then project management costs should be zero. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 15, 2011. A project management unit will be established within the Rural Energy Authority. \$130,000 is requested, which is more than 5%, and a justification is provided. CEO clearance will be requested.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>No. There is inadequate explanation of how funding is allocated to achieve the incremental expected outcomes over the baseline project. Consistent with the comment in paragraph 17, please clarify the apportionment of funding for each of the objectives and specifically the elements in Component 3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. The estimates provided in response to box 17 are helpful, but do not adequately delineate the baseline project. Please clarify the funding for the baseline project.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. The baseline funding has been clarified. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>No. In Table C, a significant co-financing from the AFREA Trust Fund is identified, along with a smaller co-financing from the World Bank but there is inadequate explanation of the co-financing. Please clarify how the details in Table C align with the statement in paragraph B.6 "This project's activities will complement the Bank activities that are already being funded and will increase their effectiveness and reach. For this reason the entire amount of the current World Bank program is considered as co-financing for the proposed effort. In addition it will be partially blended with the Liberia Electricity System and Enhancement project which is currently under preparation for an estimated total of US\$50 million of which IDA is financing US\$5 million." Please define what is meant by the "entire amount" and clarify why this funding is appropriately qualified as co-financing. Please clarify the portion of the funding allocated to the baseline project.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. The additional</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		detail is very helpful and the identification of private sector cost-share is commendable. During project formulation phase, the agency is encouraged to identify additional cost-share if possible. Comment cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Clarification is needed before clearance can be recommended. Please clarify the issues identified in paragraphs 9, 12, 14, 17, 27, 28, 29, and 30.</p> <p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. Thank you for the clarifications. Comments in box 9, 14, 17(c), 17(d), 27, 29, and 30 have been cleared. Clarifications are still needed in boxes 12, 17(a), 17(b), and 28. Clarifications on endorsement are requested in boxes 3 and 7.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>DER, Sep. 28, 2010. The project is not recommended for clearance. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>DER, April 1, 2011. Most of the comments have been addressed. Please review comments in boxes 3, 8, 14, 23, and this box 34. Specifically, we need to understand how if this PIF is ready for the work program even as it is being considered under the Lighting Africa program framework.</p> <p>DER, May 20, 2011. Based on valuable discussions with the agency team, this PIF should be further developed in the combination with development of the broader Lighting Africa programmatic framework. We welcome further discussions as Liberia completes its NPFE process.</p> <p>DER, September 14, 2011. Please adjust project management costs as indicated.</p> <p>DER, September 15, 2011. Project management costs were adjusted and a justification provided. CEO clearance will be requested.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>In addition to the issues identified in paragraphs 15, 16, 22, 23, please clarify the following:</p> <p>1) With respect to question 14 and 15, please address the following issues a) For Component 1, Renewable Energy</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Policy Formulation and Implementation, Please clarify the timetable for policy development and implementation in those areas that may impact successful implementation of Component 3, Lighting Liberia. For example, will "Standards for RE equipment put in place" include the formal regulatory adoption of Lighting Africa quality assurance standards? Furthermore, please address whether the import duties waiver will be designed to ensure that only products that meet the Lighting Africa quality assurance standards be eligible for the import duty waiver.</p> <p>b) Please explain the timetable for expected outcomes of evaluations conducted in Component 1 - what is the expectation that the evaluations will lead to legislative proposals and eventual adoption during the project period?</p> <p>c) Technology progress and development of rigorous quality standards and labeling for Lighting Africa is likely to lead to significant enhancements in both products and quality standards over the next 12-18 months. Based on the timing for project implementation, please clarify the types of products meeting the Lighting Africa program requirements expected to be available and the expected cost effectiveness of products with ancillary mobile phone chargers.</p> <p>d) The role for Sustainable Solar market Packages (SSMP) model seems quite</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>viable. Please provide additional detail on the criteria for selection of project sites (e.g., community services). There is a mention of bidding in the PIF of specific concession areas of Bong and/or Lofa counties--please clarify how the requested funding will be allocated for local investments. Will the RREA provide aggregation and bulk procurement services? Also, please clarify whether SSMP projects will take place in areas with conventional electricity supply, and if so, what provisions will be made for grid integration of the solar panels.</p> <p>2) With respect to question 16, please provide more detailed description of the methodology and assumptions and quantitative estimates for the global benefits.</p> <p>3) With respect to question 22, please address the following issue. Please clarify how vendors of traditional lighting products and fuels will be engaged at all levels of the supply chain and how potentially negative jobs impacts in traditional supply chains will be overcome.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<p>32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?</p> <p>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 13, 2010	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 28, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 14, 2011	

* **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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.