



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

GEF ID:	9251		
Country/Region:	Samoa		
Project Title:	Improving the Performance and Reliability of RE Power Systems in Samoa (IMPRESS)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5669 (UNDP)
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,075,828
Co-financing:	\$38,980,000	Total Project Cost:	\$45,055,828
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	

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>	<p>MO August 6, 2015</p> <p>The project proposes to align with GEF-6, CCM Objective 1, Program 1 and 2.</p> <p>The project activities align well with CCM Program 1, which includes policies needed to promote demonstration, deployment, and financing.</p> <p>However, they do not align well with</p>	The PIF has been revised to reflect project alignment with CCM: Program 1.

<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
		<p>Program 2. In order to qualify for Program 2, project activities must be designed for "Supporting the design of innovative policy packages addressing climate mitigation concerns and socio-economic consequences." Or "Demonstrating a performance-based mechanism linked to emission reductions" or "Supporting measures to de-risk low-emission investments." More information can be found in the GEF-6 Programming Directions document (GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, May 22, 2014), pages 63-64.</p> <p>Please revise Table A to indicate alignment with CCM Program 1.</p> <p>MO August 13 2015 Comment cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>MO August 6, 2015 Yes, Samoa has the target to reduce growth rate in the volume of imported fossil fuels by 10% by 2016, and to introduce 100% renewable power in the electricity sector by 2017.</p>	
<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>MO August 6, 2015 Yes. Samoa uses renewable energy (RE), but its share has decreased since 2001 because of the lack of coherent</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>national energy policy. It also concerns the stability of electricity system when various renewable energy have been developed and integrated in the system.</p> <p>The proposed project will develop policies and provide technical and financial support so that the energy system will be improved. Biomass is relatively minor resource in the SIDS, but this project will provide good example of the use of this resource.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MO August 6, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The project will enhance integrated energy planning and facilitation of investment in both RE and energy efficiency.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MO August 6, 2015</p> <p>Please explain what technology envisaged for non-power RE-application (e.g. cooking).</p> <p>Component 3 and 4 overlap the beneficiaries of finance (e.g. RE users) and provider of finance (e.g. local bank). Please explain why two components are separated, and please consider to merger these components if appropriate.</p> <p>The study on social impact of RE of</p>	<p>At this project concept stage, the envisaged technologies include biogas generation for cooking/heating; direct biomass combustion (e.g., improved cook stoves); biomass gasification for cooking in residences and process heating in industrial applications. The final lineup of non-power RE technologies will be proposed during the project development stage.</p> <p>Not really sure about the comment. Components 3 and 4 are distinct from each other in the sense that the former is addressing the high cost of RET</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>component 4 would be better included in the component 1 to support policy development. Please revise.</p> <p>On knowledge management, there are many bio-energy projects implemented. Even though they are not necessarily in SIDS, please use experiences and lessons learnt in these projects.</p> <p>MO August 13 2015 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>applications in power generation in Samoa, while the latter will address the market barriers that could potentially impact on the sustainability of the RE development and utilization efforts of the country and set back achievements in realizing the country's target 100% RE electricity production. Whereas the improved availability of, and access to, financing for projects on electricity savings, non-power RE-application and electricity system performance improvement is one of the expected outcomes of Component 3, the increased demand and utilization of RE-generated electricity for income/revenue generation activities and social services in the country is the expected outcome of Component 4. Component 3 is also expected to make possible the financing of projects on electricity saving and power system performance enhancement by the Government of Samoa and private sector. In that regard, the original proposed output of established financing schemes for productive and social uses of RE electricity in Component 4 has been merged with the proposed TA outputs in Component 3.</p> <p>Component 3 will cater to both the financing institutions (capacity building, design and establishment of financing schemes), the energy end-users who will benefit from the financing schemes, and</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>indirectly the local engineering services providers that have the capacity to implement EE/RE technology application projects, including RE-based power generation. Component 4 will cater to energy end-users as well as to the private sector entities that are interested in upstream and downstream businesses that support EE/RE technology applications or make use of RE electricity for productive and social uses.</p> <p>Agree. The suggested output has been moved to Component 1, as well as the output: approved and enforced policies and IRRs in supporting the financing of projects on the productive and social uses of RE electricity.</p> <p>Part II, Sec. 7 has been revised to include uptake of lessons learned and best practices on bio-energy project design, installation and operation from other countries such as those in Asia, and where available from other SIDS. The results from the applications that will be carried out under the project will also be shared to other PICs and SIDS.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO August 6, 2015 Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Mo August 6, 2015 The total amount of STAR allocation for Samoa is \$6,817,289, but the proposed project requested \$6,819,999 (project cost \$6,078,310 + agency fee \$577,439 + PPG \$150,000 + agency fee \$14,250). Please revise the amount. Also, please include Table D to show the requested fund and agency fee.</p> <p>MO August 13 2015 Comments cleared</p>	<p>Based on the GEFSec's PMIS, the exact total GEF-6 STAR allocation of Samoa is US\$ 6,817,282. In this regard, the project costs have been revised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total project components cost = US\$ 5,786,503</li> <li>Project management cost = US\$ 289,325</li> <li>Total project cost = US\$ 6,075,828</li> <li>PPG request amount = US\$ 150,000</li> <li>Agency Fee = US\$ 591,454 (Fee for FSP = US\$ 577,204; Fee for PPG = US\$ 14,250)</li> <li>Total cost = US\$ 6,817,282</li> </ul> <p>Per GEFSec advice, the country's GEF OFP letter of endorsement that states a total cost of US\$ 6.82 million need not be changed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MO August 6, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 5 and 7.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MO August 13 2015 All comments are cleared. The program manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 06, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement		

<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.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>	recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		