



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

GEF ID:	<b>5649</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritius</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions for Low Carbon Island Development Strategy for Mauritius</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</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; CCM-6;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,452,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$33,520,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$35,072,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>May 08, 2014</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>David Elrie Rodgers</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Conrado Heruela</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes. Mr. Ali Mansoor, Financial Secretary & GEF OFP, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, endorsed the project on August, 16, 2013.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes. Mauritius has \$1,600,000 left in its climate change STAR allocation.  KC, April 2, 2013. Given the fact that the	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.

\*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		remaining resources in GEF-5 are limited, the proposed MSP PIF will be approved only if the resources are available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes. Mauritius has \$1,600,000 left in its climate change STAR allocation.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	NA
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Not clear. The current proposal targets CCM 2;3;4;5; and 6 FA objectives. However, there is very little or no details on the outcomes and outputs activity that are directly/indirectly attributable to CCM 2;3;4; and 5. The proposal only explains the activities that comprises of sectoral and sub-sectoral GHG inventories, capacity building, registries, MRV systems, amongst other for NAMAs. Please note that CCM focal area objectives 2, 3, 4 and 5 go beyond enabling activities. Kindly revise.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. The revised proposal focuses on CCM 3 and 6 focal area objectives. Comments cleared.</p>	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes. The project is aligned with GEF-5 CCM focal area objectives for renewable energy and capacity building under the UNFCCC.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Yes. However, there is little information of utilization of various country exercise undertaken. No explanation on the rationale of GEF support for distinction in further NAMA related analyses for priority technologies</p>	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes. Furthermore, the project emphasis to promote wind energy and other low-carbon energy sources through a NAMA is consistent with the INDC of Mauritius as published on September 28, 2015.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in various sectors from what has been already carried out such as Technology Needs Assessment (April 2013).</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. The revised proposal is in line with identified national action plan and priority areas of mitigation actions as rated under TNA report and Second National Communication. Comments cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Not Clear.</p> <p>1. "Section A.1.2. The Baseline Scenario and Associated Baseline Projects": There is no description of any baseline project that could justify the GEF incrementality.</p> <p>2. None of the components has any implementation related activities identified that address green-house gas (GHG) emission reductions.</p> <p>Please see comment in box 24.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. The revised proposal builds up GEF incrementality by piloting NAMA framework (incl. national registry and MRV system) for two utility-based wind power projects based on national priorities assessment. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Not clear.</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>a) None of the outcomes and output are directly attributable to GEF investments.</p> <p>c) No justification provided on \$20 Million investment co-financing from</p>	<p>DER, June 20, 2016. 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>Mauritius Government on the activities that may be in priority that could demonstrate successful implementation of potential NAMAs rather than government investment plans without any action directly attributable to GEF project and those may or may not take place.</p> <p>Please also consider reallocating GEF resources on the following: No distinctions illustrated in targeted FA activities amongst CCM-2; -3; -4; -5; and -6. They appear to be randomly allocated. There is no mention of number of activities that are targeted under CCM -2; -3; -4 and -5 FA outcomes (other than policy uptakes). The investment component does not give details on sector and sub-sectors activities. Furthermore, nowhere in Section A.1. GEB there is any mention on GHG emission reductions.</p> <p>Please see comment in box 24.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared. However, there is no detail on the indirect emission reductions. Please see box 25, items to be provided at PPG stage.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared. Please address comments in box 25.</p>	<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes, baseline scenario taken into account.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The preliminary estimates accounts for cumulative reduction in GHG emission of 1.65 MtCO <sub>2</sub> eq. The detailed estimate for both direct and indirect (incl. post-project stage) will be provided at the PPG stage.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		DER, June 20, 2016. Yes this is fully documented.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes.	DER, June 20, 2016. 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 resilience)	KC, December 19, 2013. Yes.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24.  KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy</li> </ul>	KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24.  KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared.  The two baseline utility-scale wind projects will be implemented as NAMA pilot to introduce Measurement,	DER, June 20, 2016. The GEF investment share supports the implementation of prioritized mitigation actions that would result in: a) Creation of enabling environment including national registry and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems that could stimulate private

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Reporting, and Verification system in the energy sector. This initiative aims to assure sustainability, and bases for scaling-up further strategies and programs formulation.</p> <p>The baseline project is a public-private partnership between the Government of Mauritius and the private sector investor which will showcase opportunities to develop further investments in the country.</p>	<p>sector investments in energy sector, and; b) Design and implementation of renewable energy NAMAs to demonstrate the transformational role of NAMA mechanism in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for baseline public-private partnership utility-scale wind energy projects. This will be recognized as the first NAMA project in Mauritius, to be registered with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes, minor changes made were properly justified.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</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?</p>	<p>KC, December 19, 2013. No. While Table C indicates no co-financing from UNEP. No details on the agency's ownership of the project in terms of project co-financing contribution, particularly in grant, to justify UNEP's ownership and due-diligence in the project. Please see comment in box 24.</p>	<p>DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Comments cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</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?	KC, December 19, 2013. Please see comment in box 24. No illustration on PPG activities is provided. Please note that the outcomes of PPG activities are being readily available for the upcoming national reports and identified prioritized NAMAs.  KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. Details have been provided. Comments cleared. Please see comments in box 25.	DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	KC, December 19, 2013. N/A.	DER, June 20, 2016. NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DER, June 20, 2016. NA
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		DER, June 20, 2016. Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval</b>	KC, December 19, 2013. Further	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p><b>being recommended?</b></p>	<p>development of this project is not recommended. The GEF Secretariat will contact the OFP to discuss about the utilization of remaining STAR resources. UNEP is requested to contact the GEF Secretariat for consultations.</p> <p>KC, April 2, 2013. Yes. The PIF has been redesigned in consultation with the GEF agency, to adequately address GEF concerns. Comments cleared. Please note that proposed PIF will be approved if the resources are available.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>KC, April 2, 2013. The Agency is expected to have the following addressed during PPG Stage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed estimate (with methodology) for DIRECT and INDIRECT (incl. post-project) GHG emission reductions for the pilot NAMA implementation project.</li> <li>2. Section A.1.3. Activity 1.3 and 1.4: The selection of sub-/sectoral NAMA based on mitigation potential will be identified to introduce a programmatic approach. Additionally, please consider exploring carbon finance options for potential sector(s) such as LULUCF.</li> <li>3. Updated and detailed implementation plan for wind energy projects based on the upcoming revision of the national sustainable energy strategy</li> <li>4. Table B: Please consider reallocation of Project Management Cost for the co-financing to the same proportion equivalent to the GEF project funding i.e. 10%</li> </ol>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		List of deliverable with CEO approval request on supported NAMA includes the following: 1. Entry to the UNFCCC NAMA Registry Portal, including GEF support for the project. 2. Submission of final co-financing letters as applicable including GEF agency. 3. Duly filled CCM tracking tool.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		DER, June 20, 2016. Yes. The project is technically cleared. The program manager recommends CEO approval.
	First review*	December 19, 2013	June 20, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2014	
	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.**