



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

GEF ID:	4904		
Country/Region:	Regional (Africa)		
Project Title:	Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-1; CCM-2; CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-3; CCM-4; CCM-4; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$14,340,000
Co-financing:	\$95,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$109,340,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Ignacio TOURINO SOTO

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?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: It is a regional project. CCA: YES. The proposed regional project will support non-Annex I Parties to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: n/a - it is a regional project	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes CCA: YES. AfDB has a strong presence across the region, along with relevant experience and adequate staff capacity to host the pilot climate technology	

*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)
		finance center and network, and to promote the transfer and adoption of relevant climate resilient technologies.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, component 3 involves a private equity instrument. AfDB is capable of managing the non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes CCA: YES. AfDB has relevant programming across the region, as well as a decentralization strategy that will bring the number of country offices to 34 out of 54 African countries by 2015.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	CCA: YES. The proposed grant (\$5.775 million) is available under the SCCF Program for Technology Transfer (SCCF-B).	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, the project is clearly aligned with the CCM focal areas CCA: NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF strategy and results framework.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>However, Section II.A.1.2 of the PIF discusses the alignment of the proposed project with UNFCCC COP decisions pertaining to the LDCF. As the project does not request resources under the LDCF, this discussion may be removed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider limiting Section II.A.1.2 of the PIF to the SCCF and SCCF-B in particular and discuss instead, in Section B.6, the manner in which the project will be coordinated with NAPA implementation efforts in the region.</p> <p>04/09/2012 -- CCA: YES. The discussion in Section II.A.1.2 of the PIF is limited to the SCCF, whereas coordination with and support towards NAPA implementation is discussed in Section II.B.6.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes. However Part A1 should mention CCM1 instead of SSM1.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards the transfer and adoption of relevant adaptation technologies (CCA-3), both through the successful demonstration and deployment of such technologies (CCA-3.1); and through strengthened enabling environments for adaptation-related technology transfer (CCA-3.2).</p> <p>The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) does not, however,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>disaggregate the proposed SCCF-B grant by focal area outcome.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a breakdown of the SCCF-B grant by focal area outcome (CCA-3.1 and CCA-3.2).</p> <p>04/09/2012 -- CCA: YES. The proposed project would allocate \$3.5 million towards CCA-3.1 and \$1.51 million towards CCA-3.2.</p> <p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: 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>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes. However, please make reference the Durban decision on tech mechanism operationalization.</p> <p>CCA: YES. As the proposed project is regional, its alignment with national strategies, policies and frameworks cannot be assessed in detail. Nevertheless, the proposed project will draw on and support the implementation of National Communications, NAPAs, NAMAs and TNAs, as well as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Moreover, the project is consistent with relevant regional strategies and action plans, such as the AU/NEPAD action plan for science and technology as well as the Nairobi Declaration on the African Process for Combating Climate Change. Finally, the proposed project will contribute towards the implementation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of Decision 1/CP.16 on the establishment of a global technology mechanism.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, as the proposed demonstration activities under Outcome 3.3 have been defined in greater detail, please describe their alignment with NAPAs, as well as the appropriate adaptation technologies identified in TNAs and National Communications.</p> <p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: 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>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, institutional capacity development through network support is a key component of the project. Outcomes, such as policy integration, mobilized investments and technology transfer will be generated utilizing the capacity developed from the project.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed project strikes a sound balance between scientific and technical assessments, capacity building and networking activities, as well as on-the-ground demonstration initiatives.</p> <p>As for the sustainability, particularly of Outcome 2.2 on policies and regulation, please describe in greater detail, by CEO Endorsement, how the proposed project would catalyze the integration of relevant adaptation technologies in national policies and investment plans, and how the project would contribute towards the sustainable implementation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of such policies and plans.	
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>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the followings:</p> <p>a) Rather than say in the baseline that "The Climate Technology Finance Center and Network falls under the platform of financing and advisory services support, ensuring that technology transfer is included in the decisional process", please express what the financing platform would have done anyway and, in the incremental reasoning section, explain what will be done with GEF money that would not have occurred otherwise.</p> <p>b) The same applies to the table presented at the end of page 11. Keep in mind that, in the incremental reasoning, you need to clearly state the difference between activities of the baseline and activities with the GEF involvement. Since the CCAP has a very broad range of potential activities as presented in page 11 figure, it requires extra attention to avoid giving the impression of duplication (the presentation of the SEFA in the baseline chapter is better on that issue).</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed SCCF-B grant would build primarily on the Climate for Development in Africa program (ClimDev), a joint initiative of the AU Commission (AUC), the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and AfDB. The program</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provides knowledge support and capacity building for climate change adaptation across the continent, along with pilot projects.</p> <p>The baseline program is adequately described at this stage. Yet, by CEO Endorsement, kindly specify the nature of the decision support tools to be developed, the capacity building to be provided, and the pilot projects to be implemented under the framework of ClimDev in order to better describe the interface between the baseline program and the activities proposed for SCCF-B financing.</p> <p>Moreover, as the SCCF-B grant will support the demonstration of adaptation technologies in the context of AfDB other investments, these investments should be identified and included in the project baseline and co-financing by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>CCM/FJ â€œ Apr 10, 2012: 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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the followings: a) see Q11. b) Please strengthen the incremental reasoning. What is clear on that issue in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the current PIF is that GEF support will cover work on the enabling environment (regulatory and administrative hurdles at the country level) that would not have been done otherwise. For the rest, one needs to show that there is some additional dimensions leading to additional emission reductions allowed by GEF involvement. The way the CCAP and the SEFA of the baseline are presented show that they take part in activities and outcomes stated as specifically GEF funding related such as "demonstrating selected low-carbon technologies and, at the country level, by financing and leveraging investments, breaking of financial, institutional, and knowledge barriers to the deployment of technology transfer, and mainstreaming technology transfer in country programming". Please state more clearly the difference between activities of the baseline and activities with the GEF involvement. You may, among other, try to make more explicit what you mean by [GEF funding will] "Ensure sustainability of the other CCAP pillars by contributing to the adequate selection of technologies, the right barriers tackled".</p> <p>CCA: YES. The PIF notes that the proposed Finance Center and Network will facilitate the full integration of relevant climate-resilient technologies in ClimDev, and support the baseline program in strengthening national and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regional centers and information networks (p. 12).</p> <p>With respect to the integration of relevant adaptation technologies in other AfDB investments, please provide further details of the relevant baseline projects and the nature of the SCCF-B support by CEO Endorsement. (see also Section 11 above)</p> <p>CCM/FJ â€œ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the followings:</p> <p>a) Please review the title of table B to mention the correct region concerned by the project.</p> <p>b) For component 1, please consider mentioning climate resilience for CCA outputs rather than for CCM's</p> <p>c) The components and outcomes numbering does not seem consistent between table B and the project description of chapter B1 (same numbering repeated, different subcomponents listed, a 4th component mentioned in project description and not in the framework table, first paragraph of component 3 description attributes sub-components 3.1 and 3.2 to adaptation and mitigation respectively while framework table and further description do not do so). Please revise adequately.</p> <p>d) For component 2, activities related to policies, institutional and organizational reforms should be considered both for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>supporting technology transfers and to remove barriers to tech transfer. Please include the later objective with appropriate activities in the framework table and in the project description.</p> <p>e) For component 2, please consider broadening the outputs on policies, institutional and organizational reforms beyond NAMAs (as is the case for CCA).</p> <p>f) For component 3, specific outputs are listed for RE and not for EE, Transport, urban development, or LULUCF. Please justify or modify adequately.</p> <p>g) Page 14, the first paragraph of project description under "Project" is not consistent with the project framework as it does not include investment in the project components. Please clarify.</p> <p>i) Please include more specific, quantifiable outputs in tables A and B.</p> <p>j) Please briefly elaborate on the sectoral focuses/priorities of the project for mitigation (especially for energy) and for adaptation. Please also present the reasons for your prioritization. You may want to explain that while investment financing may prioritize some sectors (to be listed), the project will also facilitate networks and institutional strengthening of other emerging priority sectors (to be listed).</p> <p>k) The PIF needs to better highlight the regional nature of the project. For instance, you may want to highlight the key barriers, among those listed in pages 8-9, that the project seeks to address</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>with GEF financing at the regional level. Please consider referring succinctly to potential economies of scale/scope on that mater for both capacity and financing. For national level activities, you may also refer to the possibilities for countries to mobilize national financing (from STAR, etc.) to tackle national priorities.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. SCCF-B would, according to tables A and B, contribute \$5.012 million towards components 1 through 3. Yet, the total SCCF-B grant requested is \$5.25 million, excluding Agency fees.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that tables A and B account for all SCCF-B resources requested, with the exception of Agency fees.</p> <p>04/09/2012 -- CCA: YES.</p> <p>CCM/FJ â€™ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012:</p> <p>a) No methodology and estimation of incremental benefit are presented yet. Please complete.</p> <p>b) The GHG incremental reduction of the project in page 19 seems very low. Please revisit this figure - even with a conservative estimate.</p> <p>CCA: YES.</p> <p>CCM/FJ â€™ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed project would contribute towards climate-resilient development in key sectors across the continent.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: No. The involvement of technology users would probably more efficient if started at the barrier analysis and technology selection stages, before the impact analysis and investment stage. Please consider strengthening their involvement.</p> <p>CCA: By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information as to how the proposed finance center and technology network would reach out to stakeholders at the community level with a view of gathering, disseminating and strengthening indigenous and local knowledge, particularly on technologies for climate-resilient rural livelihoods.</p> <p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared</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>CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Please modify the risk description at local level (still referring to local communities) to ensure consistency with the stakeholders considered in the left column of the table.</p> <p>CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: A detailed description of the coordination mechanisms will be need at the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	region?	endorsement stage. CCA: YES. Coordination with other related initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project development. As noted in the PIF, further detail in this regard will be provided by CEO Endorsement.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: see Q20 CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared	
	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?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, below 5%. CCA: NOT CLEAR. Please clarify whether SCCF-B resources will be allocated towards project management. 04/09/2012 -- CCA: YES. \$237,971 from SCCF-B would be allocated towards project management, representing 4.47 per cent of the sub-total for SCCF components.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: For component 2, please justify the very high level of technical assistance required (12.3 MUSD). It is reminded that feasibility studies for investment, if relevant, should be considered as	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		investment. CCA: YES. CCM/FJ ‘ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: The co-financing ratio is 1:6.6. Please reconfirm that AfDB \$95 million co-financing is composed entirely of grants. CCA: The indicative co-financing is adequate. By CEO Endorsement, please include co-financing associated with the AfDB investments towards which outcomes 3.3 and 3.4 would contribute. (see also Section 11 above) CCM/FJ ‘ Apr 10, 2012: Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: Yes. The AfDB is providing all of the co-financing amount.	
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?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: n.a.	
	• Convention Secretariat? • Council comments?		

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"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	CCM - FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	CCM/FJ Apr 10, 2012: Please refer to sections 19. CCA: Please refer to sections 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19 and 25.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 02, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

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	3. Is PPG approval being	

Recommendation	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.