



**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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,365,753
Co-financing:	\$20,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,515,753
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Lucas Black

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 - Jan 13, 2014: Yes, Sudan ratified the UNFCCC on Nov 19, 1993.	MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point 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.	MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available 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.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

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"> the STAR allocation? 		MY 12/8/2015 Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes. The remaining CCM allocation of Sudan is \$4,897,681. The project requests a total of \$4,890,000.	MY 12/8/2015 N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		MY 12/8/2015 N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		MY 12/8/2015 N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		MY 12/8/2015 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>	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes. The project targets CCM-3 (renewable energy development).
<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>		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.	MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 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 baseline project(s) , 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.	MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (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</p>	MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF. Table B in the CEO ER document is close to that in the PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<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> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes, in the last two pages of the CEO ER. (the page number is missing in the CEO ER).</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared on page 20 of the PIF.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of water resources. c) Please clarify how the project will mitigate the two risks.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes, as cleared in the PIF.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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. 	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Please address Q5 and Q7.</p> <p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>Please write one paragraph for each of the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drivers of global environmental degradation. What are the root causes or drivers to the current situation of not using solar PV in water pumping in the country? How to deal with these drivers and root causes? 2. Innovation. Why is this project innovative to the country? When compared with other similar existing or historical projects, what is special in this proposed project? 3. Sustainability. How will the results of this project continually be applied or used or in operation after the project implementation period is over? 4. Market transformation. How will this project bring transformational changes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			to the country? 5. Scaling-up. How will the project results be applied to other part of the country? MY 1/7/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		MY 1/7/2016 Yes, the project structure/design is sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF.
	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?		MY 12/8/2015 Not at this time. Please undertake a brief analysis to compare solar PV based water pumps against wind power based water pumps or other RE based water pumps and justify cost-effectiveness of this project. MY 1/7/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.
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.	MY 12/8/2015 Not at this time. Some of the co-financing is actually in-kind but used in cash or equity or loan. Please see comments in box 17. MY 1/7/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were 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	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: UNDP is bringing 1% of the total co-financing of \$26 million. Please consider increasing the UNDP co-financing.	MY 12/8/2015 Not at this time. Please provide:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Comment cleared. UNDP is now bringing 2% of the total co-financing of \$26 million.</p>	<p>1. A letter from the Ministry of Water Resources and Electricity that shows its cash contribution of \$1.5 million to this project. 2. A letter from the Ministry of Environment, Higher Council ... that shows its contribution of \$500,000 cash to this project. 3. A letter from the Ministry of Agriculture ... that shows its contribution of \$150,000 cash to this project.</p> <p>The letters from the above mentioned organizations do not match the kinds of co-financing indicated in Table C.</p> <p>MY 1/7/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared. All co-financing letters are attached to the project document.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: Yes.</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes.</p>
	<p>19. <u>At PIE</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?</p>	<p>FJ - Jan 13, 2014: The PPG request does not deviate from the norm.</p>	<p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: The project is a grant.	MY 12/8/2015 As cleared in the PIF.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		MY 12/8/2015 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		MY 12/8/2015 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		MY 12/8/2015 Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		MY 12/8/2015 N/A
	• The Council?		MY 12/8/2015 Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		MY 12/8/2015 N/A
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	FJ - Jan 13, 2014: No. Please address the comments above. Please contact the GEF secretariat prior to resubmission. FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Yes. The project is technically cleared for inclusion in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	FJ - Jan 21, 2014: Details are expected by CEO endorsement request on the following: a) The proposed micro-finance products, how they will be made economically attractive to private banks and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>economically feasible for small-scale farmers given they level of income. b) The proposed subsidy scheme and national PV fund: how they will be implemented and how they will be sustained beyond project completion. c) The market monitoring scheme of the project. d) How the project may mobilize the carbon finance without leading to a risk of double-counting of mitigation efforts. e) How the project will facilitate the banks involved in supplying micro-finance credit products to extend their lending to other technology categories, such as improved cook stoves and biogas digesters.</p> <p>MY 12/8/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>MY 12/8/2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes: 13, 15, 16, and 17.</p> <p>MY 1/7/2016 Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared. The PM recommends CEO Endorsement clearance.</p>
	First review*	January 13, 2014	December 08, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 21, 2014	January 07, 2016
	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.**