



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

GEF ID:	5375		
Country/Region:	Nigeria		
Project Title:	Scaling up Small Hydro Power (SHP) in Nigeria		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,689,680
Co-financing:	\$14,870,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,609,680
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval			
Program Manager:	Alex Njuguna Waithera	Agency Contact Person:	Jossy Thomas

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes, by letter signed on February, 13th 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes, the CC Allocation remaining is \$6,373,230 which is within the funding requested by the proposed project.	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	N/A	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes, the project is aligned with CCM-3 Strategic objective.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes, the project is consistent with the National Energy Policy (NEP) which aims at expanding the electricity access to 75% of the total population by 2020. It also aims at developing and promoting the country's RE resources and promoting the decentralized energy supply based on renewable resources, especially in rural areas. The project is also consistent with the Initial National Communication to the UNFCCC which recognizes increased use of renewable resources, consisting of the introduction of small-scale hydro plants.	
	<p>6. 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>	ANW, April 8, 2013: The PIF mentions that there has been local capacity development to design and manufacture MHP systems of up to 125kW. Please explain the value added for the GEF with the development of local capacity to fabricate capacity at least up to 300kW. In other words, please describe the incrementality of the proposed activities in detail.	

Project Design		<p>GEF funding will be used mainly for the incremental element in upgrading the existing local fabrication capacity from 125kW to 300kW. This will enable the local availability of turbine capacities up to 300kW and thereby drastically bring down the cost of SHP projects in the country and facilitate replication.</p> <p>Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>ANW, April 8, 2013</p> <p>Under component 1:</p> <p>a) Please clarify on how the capacity development will be sustained at the SHP Technology Centre of Nigeria.</p> <p>b) Please clarify on how capacity development will move beyond the SHP Technology Centre of Nigeria and be entrenched in the manufacturing policy of Nigeria.</p> <p>Under component 2:</p> <p>c) The PIF is silent about the technical quality standards for SHP. Please clarify whether Nigeria have existing quality standards for SHP. Also please clarify how the project will work with the body responsible for standards to ensure enforcement of these standards.</p> <p>Under component 3:</p> <p>d) A portion of GEF grant will be used to provide subsidy for electromechanical equipment for the selected SHP plants. Please explain the sustainability of the subsidy and what will happen after the project is over.</p> <p>e) Please clarify how this project will lead to more investments for SHP for power generation in Nigeria.</p> <p>f) Please explain how the project intends to engage the private sector, including the manufacturing sector and power sector in the development of SHP in Nigeria.</p>	

		<p>g) Please consider re-aligning this component with knowledge management and best practice generation and dissemination.</p> <p>ANW, April 12, 2013:</p> <p>a) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) A new project output with the objective "National standards developed for SHP" has been added in the revised PIF. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) At CEO endorsement, please elaborate on the specific financial incentives and modalities which will be developed by the project to promote replication of SHP.</p> <p>e) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>f) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) The existing project component 4 "monitoring and evaluation (M&E)" has been realigned and include knowledge management and best practice dissemination. Comment cleared.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes	
	9. 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?		

	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	ANW, April 8, 2013: 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)	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	ANW, April 8, 2013: a) The innovative aspects of the project are not well articulated. Please elaborate on the innovativeness of the project. b) Please clarify how the proposed project will lead to large replication and scaling up of SHP in Nigeria. c) Please clarify on the project's sustainability strategy and how the activities of the project will be sustained even after project's closure. ANW, April 12, 2013: a) Local fabrication of SHP turbines and controls is entirely new to Sub-Saharan Africa. As of now, local fabrication of SHP turbines and controls up to 125kW exists only in Nigeria through UNIDO's efforts. This project aims to strengthening the fabrication capacity up to 300kW. Comment cleared. b) Clarification provided. Comment cleared. c) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.	

	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes	
	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?	ANW, April 8, 2013: The co-financing provided by UNIDO is small with 0.54% of the total co-financing. Please increase co-financing. ANW, April 12, 2013: At CEO endorsement, please increase cash co-financing.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	ANW, April 8, 2013: 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?	ANW, April 8, 2013: Yes, a PPG of \$50,000 is requested.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	ANW, April 8, 2013: This is a grant.	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>ANW, April 8, 2013: Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes 6,7,13 and 17.</p> <p>ANW, April 12, 2013 The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>ANW, April 12, 2013</p> <p>a) Confirmation and detailed analysis of GHG emission reduction figures.</p> <p>b) A detailed analysis of the specific financial incentives and modalities, which will be developed by the project to promote replication of SHP.</p> <p>c) Strengthening of the project framework to include concrete, measureable indicators.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 08, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 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.**