



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

GEF ID:	9292		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Increasing Energy Access Through the Promotion of Energy Efficient Appliances in Liberia		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$37,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$39,639,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	BAH, THIerno

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 8/17/2015 Yes.  This project is aligned with Programs 1 and 2 of Objective 1 of the GEF6 CCM Strategies: To promote low-carbon technologies and mitigation options, and to promote innovative policy packages and market initiatives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	MY 8/17/2015 Yes. It is stated on page 17 of the PIF.	

<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
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<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 8/17/2015 Not completed at this time. Please write one paragraph to justify that this project will address drivers of global environmental degradation. The following outline may be used for the paragraph:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Energy consumption and GHG emissions per capita or in total in the country is low, but it may dramatically increase with the development of economy and urbanization (using some updated data and references);</li> <li>2. The potential benefits of energy efficiency investment in appliances in the country are huge in long run;</li> <li>3. Barriers to the investment in energy efficiency;</li> <li>4. How this GEF project will unlock these barriers and achieve EE benefits.</li> </ol> <p>It seems that the information is in the PIF, but it is not summarized on one paragraph.</p> <p>MY 8/20/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>AfDB 19/08/2015 PIF has been revised, see last 2-3 paragraphs section 1, page 7</p>

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MY 8/17/2015 Not at this time.</p> <p>Please write one short paragraph on how this project will facilitate Liberia to develop its low-carbon path in the market in the next decades. The Agency may highlight the impacts of new policy development, technology transfer, capacity building, etc. on the energy efficiency market development. The Agency may stress that without the GEF project, these EE activities would not happen in the next decades.</p> <p>MY 8/20/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>AfDB 19/08/2015 PIF has been revised, see point 1.4 in page 11.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MY 8/17/2015 Not at this time.</p> <p>1. The sum of sub-total amount of co-financing in Table B (\$53,600,000) and the project management cost (\$1,500,000) does not reach the number \$57.8 million. Please check the calculation and correct the number.</p> <p>2. Please put the number of training or workshops and the number of people to be trained in Table B (project</p>	<p>AfDB 19/08/2015 Cofinancing amount has been revised, see table A, B and C. The AFD financing is restructured for another sector and cannot be justified for this project. Therefore cofinancing amount has been reduced.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>outputs 1.2 on page 1). Please also put the numbers of incentive mechanisms (project outputs 1.3 on page 2) and feasibility reports (project outputs 1.4 on page 2) to be achieved.</p> <p>3. In Component 3 on page 2, please put targeted numbers for outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.8. We do not accept "TBD" in Table B. These numbers can be initially estimated now and finalized at the CEO ER stage.</p> <p>MY 8/20/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MY 8/17/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>Please indicate how this project will benefit indigenous peoples if it is relevant.</p> <p>MY 8/20/2015 Yes. The comments was addressed.</p>	<p>AfDB 20/08/2015 This section is not relevant for this project for now. However, further analysis will be conducted during project baseline appraisal report and documented in CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. 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>	<p>MY 8/17/2015 Yes.</p> <p>As of 8/17/2015, the country had a remainder of STAR allocation of \$7.4</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		million.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 8/17/2015 Yes.</p> <p>As of 8/17/2015, the country had a remainder of CCM allocation of \$3.0 million.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>MY 8/17/2015 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 8/17/2015 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 8/17/2015 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 8/17/2015 Not at this time. Please see comments in Boxes: 3, 4, 5, and 6.</p> <p>In addition, The sum of project cost, agency fee, PPG and PPG fee is larger than the total amount of money endorsed by the OFP. Please revise the budget for this project.</p> <p>MY 8/20/2015 Yes. All comments were addressed and the PIF was revised accordingly.</p> <p>In the CEO ER stage, please: (1). Remove CCM-1 Program 2 and put all project budget in CCM-1, Program 1, since the project cannot</p>	<p>AfDB 20/08/2015 Questions 3,4,5 and 6 have been addressed. The OFP endorsed a total of \$3million including PPG (\$100,000), Project grant (\$2,615,000) and Fees (\$285,000). PIF shows a PPG (\$100,000), Project grant (\$2,639,726) and All Fees including PPG fees (\$260,274). A slight reduction of fees has been done to increase Project grant, for additional \$24,726. We do not believe this is in contradiction with OFP endorsement.</p>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		<p>really create innovative policy packages and market initiatives.            (2). Write one paragraph to show that this project will not directly create new energy efficiency standards and codes, but the AfDB will work closely with national agencies which are developing and managing these energy efficiency standards and codes, as indicated in the PIF already but not so evidently.</p> <p>The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 17, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 20, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
		10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<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.