



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

GEF ID:	4840		
Country/Region:	Sierra Leone		
Project Title:	Sustainable use of biomass as a source of domestic energy use through innovative technologies and private sector involvement		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4904 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,768,182
Co-financing:	\$10,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,768,182
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Saliou Toure

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?	FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, Sierra Leone ratified the Climate Change Convention June 22, 1995	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, by letter dated Feb 24, 2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	FJ March 20, 2012: The adequacy of UNDP's capacity to have the project scaled up to a transformational level (see Q14 comment a)) remains to be demonstrated. FJ Apr 5, 2012: This will have to be reviewed at CEO-endorsement stage after more details on the financial	

*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)
		mechanisms and tools for investment have been provided.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	FJ March 20, 2012: The project is a grant.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	FJ March 20, 2012: see Q3	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	FJ March 20, 2012: Yes, 2 MUSD remain under the CCM allocation of Sierra Leone.	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	FJ March 20, 2012: Please explain why the testing of improved cook stoves prototypes is CCM3 and not CCM1 or CCM2. FJ Apr 5, 2012: The previous comment is not addressed yet: a) Improving cook stove efficiency relates to energy efficiency, which is CCM2. Please modify accordingly. b) Please refer to the GEF-5 template reference guide for the list of outcomes and outputs of Table A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624). Outcomes 3.3 or 2.3 are not valid outcomes under GEF-5.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: In table A, the balance between funding allocated to CCM-2 and CCM-3 do not seem in accordance with table B. Most outcomes of table B and especially investment outcomes are related to improved kilns and cook stoves, both related to energy efficiency improvement and thus to CCM-2. Only few outcomes of table B relate to improved sustainability of fuel wood resources (CCM-3). Table A shows a different balance with two thirds of the funding going to CCM-3. Please adjust.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 2, 2012: Please consider also refocusing Output 1.1 and 1.3 since they refer respectively to "managing biomass utilization" and "incentive schemes for biomass energy technology applications".</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: see Q7</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: Please explain the consistency of the project with Sierra Leone's national communication under UNFCCC (Jan 8 2007).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: The sustainability of project outcomes relies on financial, fiscal and regulatory instruments that are not detailed, and neither is the capacity development needed for them. Please be more accurate on the instruments to be implemented and the associated capacity development.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
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>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please explain what the existing baseline projects' activities manage to do in overcoming the identified barriers and what remains to be overcome thanks to the GEF involvement.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: The previous comment is not addressed yet. Please indicate clearly in the PIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The barriers that the baseline activities aim to overcome (8 out of the 15 identified barriers) and the related activities; b) The remaining 7 barriers on which the project with GEF funding will focus. <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Cleared.</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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: Please demonstrate more clearly what activities and results are expected with GEF financing that would not have occurred with baseline projects. Sentences saying that GEF funding will allow to do more or to enhance existing projects are not sufficient.</p> <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: Please include in the PIF document, for each component, the description provided in the response regarding (i) what the GEF funding will support and (ii) what would have happened otherwise in the baseline situation.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: The previous comment is not fully addressed yet. Indication are given as to which barriers the GEF funding will help overcome but no indication is provided yet in the PIF as to what type of activities the GEF will fund for each component.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the following comments: a) Since a lot of projects in Africa have accumulated experience on cook stove deployment, one is expecting new projects dealing with cook stove to reach a transformational goal at the level of a whole country with appropriate activities. Please strongly upscale the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>current scale of the project (only one region concerned in the country, with 200 kilns and 500 improved cook stove by the end of the project) for it to be further considered.</p> <p>b) Component 1, 2 and 3: Please detail the type and scope of the financial mechanisms, regulations, standards and incentives schemes envisioned by the project. Please also include activities that will ensure implementation and enforcement of these measures.</p> <p>c) Please explain and justify what impact/outcome is expected by developing inclusive supply and value chains for renewable fuel wood for charcoal production and ICS use.</p> <p>d) Please explain what is expected by establishing and operational framework for the phase-out of traditional cook stoves, how this is expected to proceed and how the project will ensure the enforcement of such framework.</p> <p>FJ â€œ Apr 5, 2012: No. The previous comments have not been fully addressed:</p> <p>a) Please confirm, in the PIF document, that the aim of the project is indeed to (i) create an enabling environment for the production and use of sustainable kilns and improved cook stoves, (ii) support a first large scale deployment of these technologies and (iii) ensure that the subsequent national transformational diffusion of these technologies will be ensured by setting up sustainable</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>financial mechanisms and tools for investment.</p> <p>b) More details on the financial mechanisms and tools for investment will have to be presented at CEO-endorsement stage along with a proper demonstration of (i) their potential sustainability and (ii) their incrementality compared to the marketing practices in place (such as those set up by Toyola for instance).</p> <p>c) Regarding the previous comment c) above, setting up some controlled and well managed wood lots does not guarantee that future kilns and ICSs will use sustainable wood source. Some additional activities would be needed to (i) ensure that kilns and ICSs mainly use sustainable wood source (e.g. control and enforcement) and (ii) sustain the development of enough wood lots to supply sustainable wood for kilns and ICSs.</p> <p>d) More details on the framework for the phase-out of traditional cook stoves and its sustainability will be needed at CEO-endorsement stage.</p> <p>e) While components 2 and 3 appear fairly consistent with one another, some activities of component 1 (especially output 1.5.) along with the involvement of Addax as cofinancier do not appear to have any close relation with the focus of the project on sustainable kilns and ICSs. Please consider to focus the project on kilns and ICSs' related activities.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012:</p> <p>a) Detailed information is expected at CEO endorsement stage on the activities aiming at (i) ensuring that kilns and ICSs mainly use sustainable wood source (e.g. control and enforcement) and (ii) sustaining the development of enough wood lots to supply sustainable wood for kilns and ICSs.</p> <p>b) Comment e) above is not fully addressed yet. The involvement of Addax in the project still does not appear to have any strong relation with sustainable charcoal kilns or ICS. Several elements of the document (part B1 page 6, part B6 page 16) along with available information on Addax sugar cane project indicate that Addax's interest and activities will focus on biofuels (and related policies) rather than on kilns or ICS. Its inclusion in the project does not appear justified, may skew the efforts of component 1 towards biofuel policies rather than policies related to kilns and ICS. Please strongly justify or consider removing Addax activities from this project proposal. Please also modify all remaining outcomes that are not related to kilns or ICS (such as output 2.1. for instance).</p> <p>c) Please clarify that the incentives aimed at scaling up charcoal and ICS commercialization will be designed, set up and launched in order to be able to replace all cookstoves at country level.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ - Aug 2, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please include the response elements in the PIF document for component 2.</p> <p>b) Please consider modifying page 11 of the PIF document the following sentence: "The GEF will also support the detailed analysis for the development of incentives and the phase-out of traditional cookstoves" into "The GEF will also support the detailed analysis for the development of incentives and the phase-out of traditional cookstoves and the initial implementation of these incentives".</p> <p>c) Since one of the objective of the project will be the design and setting in place of a sustainable mechanisms incentivizing the replacement of cook stove at country level, one expects the demonstrations of output 2.4 to be using and testing such mechanism (to prepare for a larger scale implementation). Please clarify in the PIF document that this will effectively be the case.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012:</p> <p>a) Please explain more clearly the CO2 emission reductions expected from using sustainable charcoal kilns.</p> <p>b) Please clarify how the sustainability of wood sources will be ensured and enforced.</p> <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: No. The previous comments have not been fully addressed:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a) Please insert the detailed descriptions as an annex to the PIF;</p> <p>b) Please inform on the sources of the different values used for the calculation;</p> <p>c) Please take into account the STAP's comments to the Uganda PIF PMIS ID 4644. They suggest the energy efficiency of the Casamance kiln is highly dependent on the skill of the individual operating the kiln, and that very good traditional kilns can compete with Casamance kilns. Please consider focusing on retort kilns.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: Yes. The involvement of women in the project is particularly detailed.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: Yes</p>	
	<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>	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please clarify the sustainability of the mitigation measures envisioned to ensure climate resilience (sufficient buffer zone around woodlots will be established to ensure proper protection against major rainfalls and/or floods).</p> <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: Please add the response explanation as footnote to the table.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Cleared.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please clarify the coordination mechanisms among the various existing projects involved in this GEF project.</p> <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: Please provide brief descriptions of what the coordination mechanisms among the various existing projects involved could look like. Further details will be expected at CEO-endorsement stage.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: A detailed description is expected at CEO-endorsement stage.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. While several financial or fiscal instruments are to be implemented thanks to the project, no involvement is considered for the Ministries in charge of such policies. Please modify the project to ensure such involvement at an early stage and during the project.</p> <p>Besides, please take into account the fact that emission reductions accounted for carbon credits within the CDM cannot be funded by the GEF.</p> <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: Please consider modifying the role of the Ministry of Finance to involve it also in the conception phase of the financial mechanisms and incentives (not only the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>establishment and operationalization).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Cleared.</p>	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	FJ March 20, 2012: Yes. They account for less than 10% of GEF requested funding.	
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012:No. Please clarify how the numerous activities considered may be implemented properly with the amount of funding considered.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Please clear Q14 and modify the financing figures accordingly if relevant.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Please clear Q14 and modify the financing figures accordingly if relevant.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: The co-financing ration is 1:5.65. Please specify the private companies considered for the co-financing.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Please clear Q14 b) and e).</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Please clear Q14 and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		modify the financing figures accordingly if relevant.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	FJ March 20, 2012: The Agency is not providing any co-financing. Please adjust. FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Cleared,	
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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	FJ March 20, 2012: n.a.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. Please consider especially the comments concerning the scale of the project before any other comment.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: No. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: No. Please address the above comments. Please pay particular attention to the remaining comment in Q14.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Yes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Special attention will be devoted at CEO endorsement to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposed activities related to the financial mechanisms and tools for investment are in line with the Agency's comparative advantage. b) The financial mechanisms, tools for investment and incentives proposed are detailed and come with a proper demonstration of (i) their potential sustainability and (ii) their incrementality compared to the marketing practices in place (such as those set up by Toyola for instance). c) The framework for the phase-out of traditional cook stoves and its sustainability are detailed. d) Detailed information is provided on the activities aiming at (i) ensuring that kilns and ICSs mainly use sustainable wood source (e.g. control and enforcement) and (ii) sustaining the development of enough wood lots to supply sustainable wood for kilns and ICSs e) The coordination mechanisms among the various existing projects involved is detailed. <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) The demonstrations of output 2.will be using and testing the mechanism and incentives of component 2 aiming at encouraging the replacement of traditional cook stoves all over the country. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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*	March 23, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 03, 2012	
	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?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please consider adding feasibility analysis on the financial, fiscal instruments considered for the project. b) Please consider a pre analysis of the value chain at PPG stage to identify appropriate interventions along the supply chain from farmer to consumer c) Please consider analyzing the socio-economic interest of using improved cook stove and analyzing the economic benefits expected for sustainable wood production (compared to alternatives) and sustainable charcoal based kilns (compared to alternatives). <p>FJ Apr 5, 2012: The previous comments are cleared. The PPG will be reviewed again after the PIF modifications.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Please incorporate the necessary analysis and feasibility studies in the PPG description to ensure that the elements listed in Q31 of the PIF review will be adequately prepared for.</p>

		FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: The whole PPG will likely have to change to take into account PIF review comments especially regarding the scale of the project.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: The previous comments are cleared. The PPG will be reviewed again after the PIF modifications. Please remove activities 6 and 7 from the PPG budget proposal since they refer to agency's activities (compiling results of studies into a CEO endorsement request) that may not be funded by a PPG.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: Please modify the budget table and the Annex A (in particular the tasks to be performed) in accordance with the above necessary modifications.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 02, 2012: To avoid PPG results that might be insufficient to address the elements listed in Q31, UNDP is strongly recommended to consider increasing the budget with more co-financing for PPG components 1 and 4.</p> <p>FJ - Aug 03, 2012: Cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>FJ March 20, 2012: No. Please address above comments starting by the issue with the scale in the PIF document.</p> <p>FJ â€™ Apr 5, 2012: Not yet, as the PPG needs to reflect the PIF re-design.</p> <p>FJ - Apr 20, 2012: No. Please address above comments.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 23, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 03, 2012

* 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.