



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

GEF ID:	5673		
Country/Region:	Sudan		
Project Title:	Promoting the Use of Electric Water Pumps for Irrigation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5324 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,365,753
Co-financing:	\$26,757,484	Total Project Cost:	\$31,223,237
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Kelly

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes, Sudan ratified the UNFCCC on Nov 19, 1993.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes. Please provide a letter of endorsement clarifying the source of fund requested, the focal area concerned and the GEF Agency in the financing table.  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

\*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes. The remaining CCM allocation of Sudan is \$4,897,681. The project requests a total of \$4,890,000.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ?  <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>	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes. The project targets CCM-3 (renewable energy development).	
	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?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: No. The recent National Communication and Technology Needs Assessments do not mention PV pumping as a priority for the country. Also, emissions from irrigation represent a marginal part of the country's GHG emissions. Please clarify. Please also consider whether a modification of the project scope could be considered to encompass some of the prioritized technologies of the recent TNA for the agricultural/rural sector, (such as improved cook stoves	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and biogas units).</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Cleared. The project does not target an important share of the country's GHG emissions but is highly supported by the national institutions.</p>	
Project Design	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?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Component 1:</p> <p>a) Please clarify what are the innovative financial products to be developed by the project to drive farmer take-up of PV pump technology.</p> <p>b) The project is designed on the assumption that a limited subsidy (13%) to 1,123 PV pump units will be enough to kick start autonomous market deployment. Since this may not be the case, please consider (i) a robust monitoring of the market develop trends initiated by the project, (ii) a prolonged subsidy scheme with a decreasing subsidy level and support to secure the financing needed for such prolonged subsidy if needed.</p> <p>c) According to the PIF figures, one PV pump is five times more expensive than a diesel pump and represents 4 years of annual income of a small-scale irrigation farmer. Please clarify how this very high investment level compares to the gains in reduced production costs that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>may benefit farmers. Please also clarify how such investment can be economically feasible for the targeted small-scale farmers.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>d) Please clarify how the project will ensure the enforcement of the PV pump certification scheme during and beyond project implementation.</p> <p>e) Please clarify how the project will ensure that the means (human and financial) for continued training can be sustained beyond project completion, especially for the expected replications.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>f) Please note that the GEF cannot fund mitigation activities that would lead to CDM credits. The PIF should clarify how the project may mobilize the carbon finance without leading to a risk of double counting of mitigation efforts.</p> <p>g) Please justify the relatively high cost of the activities of component 3.</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>h) Please clarify who would benefit from the proposed fiscal concessions. Please also clarify how these concessions would support the replication of PV pumps deployment.</p> <p>i) Please clarify how the project will secure the financing necessary for effective replications of its results beyond the Northern State (to cover for the initial subsidy, the training expenses, and the certification enforcement).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comments cleared.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: The project efficiency is rather low compared to other projects (\$15/tCO2e). Please address Q5 and Q7 i) and see if this may help improve the estimated emission reduction efficiency.  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: 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)	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: a) Please clarify what are the water scarcity risks the targeted irrigated zone may face (especially due to climate change). b) Please clarify what impact the project may have on an eventual overuse of water resources. c) Please clarify how the project will mitigate the two risks.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comments cleared.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Please strongly consider involving the ministry in charge of taxes and fiscal issues to ensure that the proposed reforms in that domain may be effectively implemented.  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	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 for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Please address Q5 and Q7.  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Please address Q7 g).  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	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?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: UNDP is bringing 1% of the total co-financing of \$26 million. Please consider increasing the UNDP co-financing.  FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared. UNDP is now bringing 2% of the total co-financing of \$26 million.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: 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?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: The PPG request does not deviate from the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: The project is a grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> 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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: No. Please address the comments above. Please contact the GEF secretariat prior to resubmission.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Yes. The project is technically cleared for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Details are expected by CEO endorsement request on the following:</p> <p>a) The proposed micro-finance products, how they will be made economically attractive to private banks and economically feasible for small-scale farmers given they level of income.</p> <p>b) The proposed subsidy scheme and national PV fund: how they will be implemented and how they will be sustained beyond project completion.</p> <p>c) The market monitoring scheme of the project.</p> <p>d) How the project may mobilize the carbon finance without leading to a risk of double-counting of mitigation efforts.</p> <p>e) How the project will facilitate the</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		banks involved in supplying micro-finance credit products to extend their lending to other technology categories, such as improved cook stoves and biogas digesters.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	January 13, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 21, 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.**